



ADMINISTRATION'S RECREATION FEE PROPOSALS

Y 4. R 31/3:103-24

Administration's Recreation Fee Pro... **HEARING**
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS,
FORESTS AND PUBLIC LANDS
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON
NATURAL RESOURCES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
ONE HUNDRED THIRD CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION
ON
THE ADMINISTRATION'S RECREATION FEE PROPOSALS

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, DC
APRIL 29, 1993

Serial No. 103-24

Printed for the use of the Committee on Natural Resources



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1993

72-353

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402

ISBN 0-16-041526-8



ADMINISTRATION'S RECREATION FEE PROPOSALS

Y 4. R 31/3: 103-24

Administration's Recreation Fee Pro... **HEARING**
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS,
FORESTS AND PUBLIC LANDS
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON
NATURAL RESOURCES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
ONE HUNDRED THIRD CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION
ON
THE ADMINISTRATION'S RECREATION FEE PROPOSALS

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, DC
APRIL 29, 1993

Serial No. 103-24

Printed for the use of the Committee on Natural Resources



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1993

72-353

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402

ISBN 0-16-041526-8

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

GEORGE MILLER, California, *Chairman*

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| PHILIP R. SHARP, Indiana | DON YOUNG, Alaska, |
| EDWARD J. MARKEY, Massachusetts | <i>Ranking Republican Member</i> |
| AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania | JAMES V. HANSEN, Utah |
| NICK JOE RAHALL II, West Virginia | BARBARA F. VUCANOVICH, Nevada |
| BRUCE F. VENTO, Minnesota | ELTON GALLEGLY, California |
| PAT WILLIAMS, Montana | ROBERT F. SMITH, Oregon |
| RON DE LUGO, Virgin Islands | CRAIG THOMAS, Wyoming |
| SAM GEJDENSON, Connecticut | JOHN J. DUNCAN, Jr., Tennessee |
| RICHARD H. LEHMAN, California | JOEL HEFLEY, Colorado |
| BILL RICHARDSON, New Mexico | JOHN T. DOOLITTLE, California |
| PETER A. DeFAZIO, Oregon | WAYNE ALLARD, Colorado |
| ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA, | RICHARD H. BAKER, Louisiana |
| American Samoa | KEN CALVERT, California |
| TIM JOHNSON, South Dakota | SCOTT McINNIS, Colorado |
| LARRY LAROCCO, Idaho | RICHARD W. POMBO, California |
| NEIL ABERCROMBIE, Hawaii | JAY DICKEY, Arkansas |
| CALVIN M. DOOLEY, California | |
| CARLOS A. ROMERO-BARCELO, Puerto Rico | |
| KARAN ENGLISH, Arizona | |
| KAREN SHEPHERD, Utah | |
| NATHAN DEAL, Georgia | |
| MAURICE D. HINCHEY, New York | |
| ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD, Guam | |
| HOWARD BERMAN, California | |
| LANE EVANS, Illinois | |
| PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii | |
| THOMAS J. BARLOW, III, Kentucky | |
| THOMAS M. BARRETT, Wisconsin | |

JOHN LAWRENCE, *Staff Director*

RICHARD MELTZER, *General Counsel*

DANIEL VAL KISH, *Republican Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, FORESTS AND PUBLIC LANDS

BRUCE F. VENTO, Minnesota, *Chairman*

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| EDWARD J. MARKEY, Massachusetts | JAMES V. HANSEN, Utah, |
| NICK JOE RAHALL, II, West Virginia | <i>Ranking Republican Member</i> |
| PAT WILLIAMS, Montana | ROBERT F. SMITH, Oregon |
| PETER A. DeFAZIO, Oregon | CRAIG THOMAS, Wyoming |
| TIM JOHNSON, South Dakota | JOHN J. DUNCAN, Jr., Tennessee |
| LARRY LAROCCO, Idaho | JOEL HEFLEY, Colorado |
| NEIL ABERCROMBIE, Hawaii | JOHN T. DOOLITTLE, California |
| CARLOS A. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Puerto Rico | RICHARD H. BAKER, Louisiana |
| KARAN ENGLISH, Arizona | KEN CALVERT, California |
| KAREN SHEPHERD, Utah | JAY DICKEY, Arkansas |
| MAURICE D. HINCHEY, New York | |
| ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD, Guam | |
| AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania | |
| BILL RICHARDSON, New Mexico | |
| PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii | |

RICHARD HEALY, *Staff Director*

ALEXANDER (SANDY) SCOTT, *Professional Staff Member*

TONYA MITCHEM, *Staff Assistant*

ALLEN FREEMYER, *Republican Consultant on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands*

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Hearing held: April 29, 1993 | Page 1 |
| Member statement: Hon. Bruce Vento | 1 |
| Witness statements: | |
| Dr. G. Edward Dickey, Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) | 7 |
| Panel consisting of: | |
| David Moffitt, Assistant Director, Visitor Services, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, accompanied by Gary Marsh, Recreation Planner, Bureau of Land Management, and Michael Boylan, Acting Chief, Division of Planning and Public Use, Fish and Wildlife Service | 13 |
| Thomas J. Mills, Associate Deputy Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture | 23 |
| Panel consisting of: | |
| William J. Chandler, Conservation Director, National Parks and Conservation Association | 54 |
| Kathryn Hohmann, Washington Director, Public Lands Program, Sierra Club | 61 |
| Jim Bensberg, Vice Chairman, Task Force on Recreation Fees, American Recreation Coalition, speaking for Robert Rasor, accompanied by Amy Mann, Director, Sports and Recreation, American Horse Council | 66 |
| Additional material submitted by witnesses: | |
| Mr. Marsh: List of proposed BLM areas where entrance fees would be charged | 33 |
| Mr. Mills: List of proposed Forest Service areas where entrance fees would be charged | 37 |
| Mr. Boylan: Information regarding new and increased public recreation entrance and user fees at certain units of the National Wildlife Refuge System | 43 |
| Mr. Bensberg: Discussion paper on recreation fees initiative | 68 |
| Mr. Moffitt: | |
| 1. Revenue generation proposal provided by the National Park Service | 75 |
| 2. List of exempt parks recommended for review by the National Park Service | 80 |

APPENDIX

APRIL 29, 1993

| | |
|---|----|
| Additional material submitted for the hearing record: | |
| Prepared statement of Hon. James V. Hansen | 85 |
| Prepared statement of Hon. Jan Meyers | 88 |
| Proposed legislation to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 in regard to recreation fees | 91 |
| Fiscal Year 1994 Fee Collection Proposal | 95 |

THE ADMINISTRATION'S RECREATION FEE PROPOSALS

THURSDAY, APRIL 29, 1993

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS,
FORESTS, AND PUBLIC LANDS,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met at 2 p.m. in room 1324 of the Longworth House Office Building, Hon. Bruce F. Vento, chairman of the subcommittee, presiding.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. BRUCE VENTO

Mr. VENTO. The Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands will come to order.

I have a long opening statement.

I'll ask consent that all statements be placed in the record. By the time we get someone else here, if they have any objection, we'll respond to that.

But the complete statements of witnesses and members will be placed in the record.

OPENING STATEMENT
CHAIRMAN BRUCE F. VENTO
OVERSIGHT HEARING ON
ADMINISTRATION'S RECREATION FEE PROPOSALS
THURSDAY, APRIL 29, 1993

THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, FORESTS AND PUBLIC LANDS
WILL COME TO ORDER.

TODAY WE WILL HEAR TESTIMONY ON THE ADMINISTRATION'S
PROPOSALS CONCERNING ENTRANCE AND USER FEES AT NATIONAL PARKS,
FORESTS, WILDLIFE REFUGES, RECREATION AREAS AND OTHER PUBLIC
LANDS. THESE PROPOSALS ARE A PART OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S BUDGET
AND ECONOMIC PLAN. THE ADMINISTRATION HAS PROPOSED INCREASES IN
ENTRANCE AND USER FEES AT DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, FOREST
SERVICE, AND ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEER LANDS TALLING OVER \$60
MILLION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994 AND LARGER AMOUNTS FOR THE ENSUING
YEARS. DRAFT LEGISLATION TO IMPLEMENT THESE FEES HAS JUST THIS
WEEK BEEN SENT TO CONGRESS BY THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND
BUDGET.

THE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES HAS BEEN DIRECTED BY THE
HOUSE BUDGET RESOLUTION TO REPORT CHANGES IN LAW WHICH WOULD
PRODUCE \$131 MILLION IN INCREASED REVENUES OR REDUCED OUTLAYS IN
FISCAL YEAR 1994. THESE CHANGES IN LAW MUST BE REPORTED BY THE
FULL COMMITTEE BY THE MIDDLE OF MAY AND THEY WILL BECOME A PART
OF THE OMNIBUS RECONCILIATION BILL. WHILE THE COMMITTEE MUST
PRODUCE CHANGES IN LAW TO MEET THESE TARGETS, THERE IS NO
REQUIREMENT THAT THE COMMITTEE USE THE SPECIFIC REVENUE PROPOSALS
OF THE ADMINISTRATION.

BEFORE WE HEAR THE DETAILS OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S
RECREATION FEE PROPOSALS, I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE SEVERAL

OBSERVATIONS. FIRST, I AM PLEASED THAT THE ADMINISTRATION'S FEE PROPOSALS PROVIDE FOR RECREATION FEE REVENUES TO GO BACK INTO MAINTAINING AND ENHANCING THE NATURAL, CULTURAL AND RECREATIONAL RESOURCES OF THE PUBLIC LANDS WHERE THE FEES ARE COLLECTED. THE AMERICAN PEOPLE OWN THE PUBLIC LANDS AND THEY ARE ALREADY PAYING FOR THEM THROUGH THEIR TAXES. I BELIEVE THEY ARE WILLING TO PAY REASONABLE FEES FOR USE OF THESE LANDS BUT ONLY IF THERE IS A DIRECT CONNECTION BETWEEN THE FEES COLLECTED AND THE IMPROVEMENT OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR ENJOYMENT OF PUBLIC LANDS.

SECOND, I AM DISTURBED BY THE ADMINISTRATION'S RECENT DECISION NOT TO PURSUE GRAZING FEE AND MINING LAW REFORM AS PART OF THE RECONCILIATION PROCESS. WHILE THE ADMINISTRATION HAS INDICATED THAT IT WILL PURSUE THESE REFORMS SEPARATELY, THE DECISION HAS PUT THIS COMMITTEE IN A DIFFICULT POSITION. WE ARE BEING ASKED TO RAISE ENTRANCE AND USER FEES ON THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WHILE AT THE SAME TIME LETTING CONSUMPTIVE FOR-PROFIT ENTERPRISES THAT USE PUBLIC LANDS OFF THE HOOK. THIS IS EVEN MORE DIFFICULT IN LIGHT OF THE DEGRADATION OF PUBLIC LAND RESOURCES WHICH OFTEN OCCURS AS A RESULT OF MINING AND GRAZING ACTIVITIES. RECREATIONAL VISITORS ARE WILLING TO PAY THEIR FAIR SHARE, BUT ONLY IF COMMERCIAL USERS SHARE IN THE SACRIFICE AS WELL. IF THE COMMITTEE DOES PROCEED WITH INCREASED RECREATION FEES, IT SHOULD BE WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT GRAZING AND MINING REFORMS WILL BE ON THE FRONT BURNER SO THAT THE "SACRIFICE" THAT PRESIDENT CLINTON CALLED FOR IS SHARED BY ALL USERS OF THE PUBLIC LANDS.

IN ADDRESSING THE MANY ISSUES INVOLVED IN RECREATION FEES, IT IS CRITICAL TO HAVE ACCURATE INFORMATION ON FEE COLLECTION AND POTENTIAL REVENUES. IN THE PAST THE ADMINISTRATION HAS NOT BEEN ABLE TO PROVIDE SOLID INFORMATION ON WHERE THE FEE DOLLARS ARE GOING. RECREATION FEES HAVE BEEN SWALLOWED UP IN THE BUDGET WITH NO CLEAR ACCOUNTING OF WHETHER THEY PROVIDE AN EXTRA MEASURE OF EXCELLENCE OR WHETHER THEY SIMPLY REPLACE GENERAL FUND APPROPRIATIONS. THE SAME GOES FOR PROJECTIONS OF FUTURE REVENUES. LAST MONTH THE INSPECTOR GENERAL ISSUED A REPORT SAYING THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE COULD COLLECT AN ADDITIONAL \$105 MILLION IN ENTRANCE FEES WITHOUT ANY CHANGES IN EXISTING FEE LEGISLATION. FROM WHAT I HAVE SEEN I WOULD I AGREE WITH THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE THAT THIS IS A WILDLY INACCURATE PROJECTION BUT I DO NOT KNOW WHAT NUMBER SHOULD BE USED INSTEAD. I EXPECT THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE AND OTHER AGENCIES TO COMMENT ON HOW MUCH THEY THINK IMPROVED COLLECTION COULD ACCOUNT FOR. BEFORE WE PROCEED WITH AUTHORIZATION FOR CHARGING NEW AND HIGHER FEES, WE SHOULD HAVE A VERY GOOD PICTURE OF HOW MUCH MORE WE COULD GET BY ENHANCING THE COLLECTION OF CURRENTLY AUTHORIZED FEES.

IN 1987 THIS SUBCOMMITTEE MADE A SUBSTANTIAL REWRITE OF THE LAW GOVERNING RECREATION FEE POLICY ON OUR PUBLIC LANDS. THE 1987 AMENDMENTS WERE A BIPARTISAN EFFORT WHICH INVOLVED A NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE AND A CONSIDERABLE AMOUNT OF TIME. AS MEMBERS WHO HAVE WORKED ON THESE ISSUES BEFORE KNOW, FEE ISSUES ARE COMPLEX AND SOMETIMES CONTROVERSIAL. SOME INDIVIDUALS AND INTEREST GROUPS HAVE URGED THIS SUBCOMMITTEE TO ADDRESS RECREATION FEES IN A COMPREHENSIVE WAY WITH A COHERENT FEDERAL

POLICY RATHER THAN JUGGLING NUMBERS TO REACH AN ARBITRARY REVENUE TARGET. OTHERS HAVE ASKED US TO TAKE RECREATION FEES OUT OF THE RECONCILIATION PROCESS SUCH AS WAS DONE WITH MINING AND GRAZING FEES AND EITHER DEAL WITH THEM SEPARATELY OR NOT DEAL WITH THEM AT ALL. THE SHORT TIME FRAME INVOLVED IN RECONCILIATION DOES NOT BODE WELL FOR A COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH, ESPECIALLY CONSIDERING THE LACK OF FEE INFORMATION CURRENTLY AVAILABLE.

AS ALWAYS, I APPROACH THE RECREATION FEE PROPOSALS WITH AN OPEN MIND. A GOOD CASE CAN BE MADE FOR INCREASED RECREATION FEES IF CERTAIN PRINCIPLES ARE UPHELD. (1) FEES SHOULD NOT BE SO HIGH THAT THEY DISSUADE PEOPLE FROM VISITING OUR NATIONAL PARKS, FORESTS AND PUBLIC LANDS; (2) THEY MUST BE DEDICATED TO IMPROVE RESOURCE PROTECTION AND VISITOR SERVICES; AND (3) FEE INCREASES MUST BE CARRIED OUT IN A CONTEXT OF MUTUAL SACRIFICE BY OTHER USERS OF PUBLIC LANDS, ESPECIALLY COMMERCIAL AND CONSUMPTIVE USERS.

DO OTHER MEMBERS WISH TO MAKE OPENING STATEMENTS?

Mr. VENTO. Today we're convening to consider entrance and user fees. These proposals are again part of the Administration's budget and economic plan.

I think that looking at the different entities that collect these fees, including the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, and the Army Corps, that these, they thought, would amount to about \$60 million.

The Committee on Natural Resources has been directed by the House Budget to come up with a total of 131 for increased revenues and outlays in 1994.

While the Committee must produce changes in the law to meet these targets, there's no requirement that the Committee use the specific revenue proposal of the Administration.

Furthermore, I am pleased that the Administration's fee proposal provides for recreation fee revenues to go back into maintaining and enhancing natural, cultural and recreational resources for public lands where the fees are collected.

Second, I am disturbed by the Administration's decision not to pursue a grazing fee and mining law reform as part of the reconciliation process, but I understand the strong position, especially of Secretary Babbitt, in terms of pursuing these independently.

Of course we will support those efforts because these particular areas of utilization, in terms of grazing permits and mining activities cause great threats to, and have great consequence in terms of public lands.

I would point out that the CBO numbers, in terms of dealing with the Administration numbers, are substantially different. In fact, they should be recognized as such, so that even with the proposals along the lines that they have advocated would not result in the type of revenue results that are anticipated or projected.

I might note that the Inspector General issued a report saying that the Park Service could collect an additional \$105 million in entrance fees without any changes in existing fee legislation.

Well, I think I find that hard to accept, having worked in this area of public policy for the last decade. But nevertheless, it does point out that there are probably significant improvements that could be made in the existing collection of fees, entrance and user fees, by at least the Park Service, and probably by other agencies as well.

We made a substantial rewrite of the fee legislation for parks in 1987. The results of it, I think, are sort of mixed. It was a bipartisan effort, and it was a significant undertaking in the short time frame that we had. I'm concerned that in trying to deal with this subject anew, we would have a very difficult time.

Of course I'm open to ideas about recreation fee proposals, and I know a good case can be made for increased recreation fees if certain principles are upheld.

Usually, I think once the case is made and the law is passed and the money comes into Washington, the second part of that, the principles involved are often forgotten and the revenue ends up in the Treasury.

I think fees should not be so high that they should dissuade people from visiting parks, forests or public lands. Certainly they must

be dedicated to improve the resource protection and visitors' service.

And third, the fee increase must be carried out in the context of mutual sacrifice by other users of public lands. So it shouldn't be disproportionate only on recreation or visitors to national parks, forests, or BLM areas.

I'm especially concerned about the commercial and consumptive uses.

So, with that said, I wanted to provide the opportunity for those that are present.

And we have a short witness list today, but some key witnesses.

Let me, before I call the witnesses, go over and cast my vote. I think that we are likely to be gone for a little bit here, because there may be two votes in a row in terms of final passage.

So maybe we could get started right now.

I don't know if Mr. Dickey is present.

I appreciate the fact that Mr. Moffitt and Mr. Mills, why don't you come to the witness table.

We'll put your statements in the record. We can get that far done, and one of you can give your oral testimony before I have to leave.

Mr. Dickey, I'd ask to have your statement placed in the record, so the Clerk will distribute the statements to the members present and staff.

Mr. Dickey, why don't you go ahead with your oral statement.

Feel free to summarize, or just read the relevant portions thereof.

STATEMENT OF DR. G. EDWARD DICKEY, ACTING ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY [CIVIL WORKS]

Dr. DICKEY. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'll be pleased to summarize my statement.

The Corps has over 4,300 separate recreation areas that provide a broad range of opportunities. The Corps operates about 2,500 of those areas. The remainder are operated by state or local governments, or quasi-public organizations or private interests.

There are, in addition, over 400 private concessionaires.

Now, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended, provides the Corps authority to collect user fees for the use of specialized sites, facilities, equipment or services furnished at federal expense.

In 1992, the Corps collected \$19.5 million under this authority, primarily from camping fees, which average \$8 per night. However, the Corps currently lacks the authority to charge fees for most day-use activities, and is required to provide one free campground at projects providing camping.

User fee revenues are deposited in special accounts in the Treasury, from which they are subsequently appropriated to the Army Civil Works Program for the purposes authorized by the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

The Administration's recreation user fee proposal would give the Corps authority to charge fees for the use of certain day-use facilities, such as picnic facilities, boat ramps, and swim beaches operated by the Corps.

These fees would range from one to three dollars. No entrance fees to Corps projects would be charged.

And also no fees would be charged for wayside exhibits, overlook sites, general visitor information, or comfort facilities.

The proposal would remove the current requirement for the Corps to provide a free campground. This authority would allow the Corps to increase the amount of operation and maintenance cost that is offset by the users of recreation facilities. It would also eliminate unfair competition with other recreation providers who must charge for their services.

In summary, the Administration's proposal would increase user fees collected at Corps projects from \$19 million to \$37 million annually. This would reduce the share of the cost to operate and maintain recreation facilities at Corps projects paid by the General Fund collection of the Treasury.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I'll be happy to answer your questions.

[Prepared statement of Dr. Dickey follows:]

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY
(CIVIL WORKS)

COMPLETE STATEMENT

OF

DR. G. EDWARD DICKEY
ACTING ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY (CIVIL WORKS)

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON
NATIONAL PARKS, FORESTS AND PUBLIC LANDS

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ADMINISTRATION'S RECREATION FEE PROPOSALS

APRIL 29, 1993

INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, I am pleased to be here today on behalf of the Department of the Army to discuss the Administration's recreation user fee proposal for water resources development areas administered by the Army. Your letter of invitation requested that we present our views regarding the legislative proposal. I will also cover the scope of our recreation program, the current recreation user fee collection program, and the changes that the proposed legislation would authorize.

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS RECREATION PROGRAM

Before addressing the recreation user fee proposal, I would like to provide some background on the Corps of Engineers recreation program. The Corps administers 11.7 million acres of land and water at 460 water resources development projects in 43 States. Although the Corps administers less than 2% of the Federal land estate, Corps projects account for almost 30% of the recreation visitation to Federal lands. The unique experiences that water-oriented recreation opportunities offer attract visitors to fish, boat, water ski, sail, swim, sightsee, hunt, camp, and picnic each year. In 1992, over 400 million recreation visits, totalling more than 2.4 billion visitor hours of use, occurred at these projects. Over 25 million individuals, or about 10% of the Nation's population, visited Corps projects at least once last year.

COOPERATIVE PARTNERSHIPS

Over 4,300 separate recreation areas at Corps projects provide outdoor recreation opportunities ranging from primitive to highly developed settings. The Corps operates about 2,500 of these areas. These 2,500 areas provide about 53% of the 400 million recreation visits at Corps projects. The remaining 1,800 are operated by State or local governments, quasi-public organizations, or private interests. State and local governments often provide opportunities specifically attuned to the needs of local populations, as well as respond to the broader interests of the general public. Quasi-public organizations address the needs of youth organizations, civic groups, and special interest groups. Over 400 private concessionaires, with gross fixed assets of over \$200 million and gross annual income of almost \$100 million, provide marina, resort and other commercial services for visitors.

CURRENT AUTHORITIES

The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act (LWCF) of 1965, as amended, provides authority for the Corps to collect recreation user fees, for the "use of specialized sites, facilities,

equipment or services furnished at federal expense." Under this authority, the Corps collected \$19.5 million in user fees in 1992, the majority of which were derived from camping fees, which average \$8 per site. Most camping fees are collected by contractors, stationed at the entrances to recreation areas. Fees are also collected for certain special-use activities, such as the reservation of group picnic shelters. However, the Corps currently lacks the authority to charge fees for most day-use activities and is required to provide one free campground at projects providing camping.

Corps recreation user fee revenues are deposited in a special account in the Treasury, from which they are subsequently appropriated to the Army Civil Works Program for any and all purposes authorized by the LWCF Act. These funds are included in Energy and Water Development Acts under the Corps of Engineers -- Civil -- Operation and Maintenance, General, Appropriation, where they are used to offset following year recreation program costs.

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL

The Administration's recreation user fee proposal would give the Corps of Engineers authority to charge fees for the use of certain day-use facilities, such as picnic facilities, boat ramps, and swim beaches operated by the Corps. These fees would be in the range of \$1 to \$3, but in no case greater than \$3 per site or activity. No entrance fees to Corps projects would be charged. Fees would not be charged for wayside exhibits, overlook sites, general visitor information, or comfort facilities. The proposal would remove the current requirement for the Corps to provide a free campground at any project having a Corps operated and developed campground. This authority would permit the Corps to expand its current fee collection program in order to increase the amount of operations and maintenance cost that is offset by the users of recreation facilities. It would also eliminate unfair competition with other recreation providers who must charge for their services.

As I mentioned earlier, about 1,800 recreation areas at Corps projects are operated by others. Most of those charge entrance or user fees and potentially compete with the Corps operated areas at which the same recreation facilities are provided free.

In summary, the Administration's proposal would increase user fees collected at Corps projects from \$19 million to \$37 million annually. This would reduce the share of the cost to operate and maintain recreation facilities at Corps projects paid by General Fund collection of the Treasury from \$150 million per year to about \$132 million.

Mr. VENTO. Let me just interject. I have to go for a vote shortly. I have a number of short questions for Mr. Dickey.

I don't know what your schedule is this afternoon.

I regret that we had to change the time of the hearing.

But let me just ask what level of development services are there at the, for instance, swimming areas.

Are there lifeguards?

Dr. DICKEY. At our swimming areas, of course, typically at reservoirs, we have improved beaches, we have change houses and comfort facilities, restrooms. We do not have lifeguards at Corps operated beaches.

Mr. VENTO. Is there a definition of developed recreation sites and facilities in your draft bill, do you know, Mr. Dickey?

Dr. DICKEY. No, there is not. But typically our developed sites are ones that include not only vehicle access and parking, we have comfort stations, and the typical amenities that would go, for example, at picnic areas. We would have comfort facilities, grills, and so forth.

Mr. VENTO. In the vision of change document, it says, fee revenues will be put into a special account to be used to offset rec program costs.

The concern we have is, does this mean that the funds would be supplemental, or would they supplant the existing funding?

Dr. DICKEY. This would supplant existing funding. In other words, the Corps operates its facilities out of appropriated funds. These funds would be available, in subsequent years, for appropriation for operation and maintenance of the Corps recreation facilities.

Mr. VENTO. So there would be no new funds, it would simply supplant existing funding?

Dr. DICKEY. I would say, in principle, that's it, but again the level of appropriations is typically tied, to some degree at least, to the availability of funds. And we found, in the cases where you do have trust funds and so forth, it facilitates appropriation.

Mr. VENTO. I note the legislation that you've submitted for us is contained in legislation amended to the Flood Control Act, the LWCF.

Is there any reason for that?

Dr. DICKEY. It amends both Acts.

The reason it addresses the Flood Control Act is because it's the Flood Control Act that requires us to provide the free campground.

Mr. VENTO. I see.

Isn't the authority for collection for the rec fees, though, and even for the campground user fees, attached to the Land Water?

You're saying it's only attached to the Flood Control?

Dr. DICKEY. No, it's both.

Mr. VENTO. It's in both. Okay.

Well, are the revenue numbers available yet regarding the elimination of the requirement of one free campground at each lake or reservoir?

Dr. DICKEY. That's a relatively small part of the reservoir. It's about \$500,000.

Mr. VENTO. Right now, you have to meet eight criteria that have to be met. I won't go through them.

Do the Army Corps of Engineers' campsites fail under any of these?

Dr. DICKEY. Virtually all of our campgrounds meet those criteria.

Mr. VENTO. So there's no increased revenue that would come?

Dr. DICKEY. We would not be able to discern the revenue differences if you changed that criteria.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Thomas, I have not voted yet. I don't know if the gentleman has voted.

Do you have any questions of Mr. Dickey from the Corps of Engineers?

I don't know what your schedule is, Mr. Dickey, but there may be other members who do have questions.

I just wanted to pursue a few with you, with the idea that perhaps he could leave, but you'll have to remain.

We'll be back.

We'll stand in recess.

We have actually a vote on this amendment and on final passage, so we'll have a two vote sequence. That's why I've dragged this out a little bit. But we'll be back, hopefully within fifteen minutes.

Thank you.

[Recess.]

PANEL CONSISTING OF DAVID MOFFITT, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, VISITOR SERVICES, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ACCOMPANIED BY GARY MARSH, RECREATION PLANNER, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, AND MICHAEL BOYLAND, ACTING CHIEF, DIVISION OF PLANNING AND PUBLIC USE, FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE, AND THOMAS J. MILLS, ASSOCIATE DEPUTY CHIEF, FOREST SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. VENTO. The subcommittee will resume its sitting.

The good news is that we've resumed; the bad news is that we're going to have to leave again for another vote soon.

So let me invite Mr. Moffitt to present his statement.

Mr. Dickey, I have no further questions. If we have any further questions, we'll submit them in writing. So depending upon your schedule, you're excused. If you want to remain, you're welcome to do so, but if you have other pressing business—

Dr. DICKEY. Thank you very much.

Mr. VENTO. You're welcome.

Mr. MOFFITT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I appreciate this opportunity to provide your subcommittee with the views of the Department of the Interior on legislation to authorize increased recreation fees and repeal the prohibition on fees for specific services for the National Park System and Lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management.

We strongly recommend the enactment of the Administration's proposed legislation that was submitted to the Congress on April 26, 1993.

The President's economic program for fiscal year 1994 and beyond proposes the elimination or reduction of certain subsidies and charging of fees for certain services provided by the Government to help bring down the deficit.

In order for the President's economic program to succeed, everyone must contribute, and the increases must be fair and reasonable.

Our goal was to increase receipts from recreation fees in fiscal year 1994 as follows:

For the National Park Service, \$28.65 million.

For the Bureau of Land Management, \$1 million.

And for the Fish and Wildlife Service, \$400,000.

Our proposed legislation would achieve that result by increasing statutory caps on certain fees, and by expanding the facilities where user fees can be charged.

In addition, the BLM would be authorized to charge admission fees at areas identified in Section 1 of the bill. The Fish and Wildlife Service can raise its fees sufficiently under current authority to meet its target.

Therefore, they are not included in the proposed legislation.

You will note, Mr. Chairman, that we have not recommended repeal of any prohibition that Congress has placed on charging fees for a specific park or classes of parks.

If the Congress wishes to do so, and the fee is feasible, we would not object to removal of exemptions.

We have made available to the Subcommittee our proposed entrance fee schedule for fiscal 1994.

Upon enactment of our proposal, and following the required 60 formal day notice to the legislative committees, these rates will be in effect in time for the calendar 1994 season.

The BLM will submit its proposed entrance fee schedule after public review.

Our proposal would increase statutory caps on the Golden Eagle Passport, the annual park pass, and single-visit entry permits. Within the new caps, we intend to phase in the increases over several years.

None of the new caps would be reached in 1994.

Specifically, in 1994, we propose to increase the Golden Eagle Passport from \$25 to \$35. This is an annual pass that authorizes entry into any park for a carload or an individual.

We anticipate reviewing the value of the passport every three or four years. If these reviews reveal that the passport is under-valued, a reasonable increase would be proposed following notification to the Committees, of course.

An increase in the cap could only be accomplished by an act of Congress.

The annual park pass, which was created in 1986 by Congress to provide unlimited admission to one park for one year, would be increased from \$15 for some parks, and \$10 for others, to \$20 and \$15, respectively.

The new ceiling of \$30 will be reached in increments every three or four years at the higher fee areas, following appropriate notice.

The single visit permit, which allows a carload of visitors to stay for seven days is capped by existing law at \$10 for three parks and \$5 for all other parks.

The fee for entry by means other than a vehicle is capped by existing law at \$5 per person for the same three parks, and \$3 per person at all others.

The three parks with the higher statutory fee caps are Yellowstone, Grand Teton, and Grand Canyon.

Our proposal would raise the caps to \$16 per vehicle and \$8 per person for all parks.

However, for 1994, no park would carry the maximum fee, and only at eleven parks would we charge \$11 per vehicle and \$5 per person. All others would carry a lesser charge in fiscal year 1994.

Again, we anticipate reviewing the value of the single visit permit every three or four years.

With regard to park user fees, existing law does not establish statutory caps on fees for such uses as camping. The act prohibits, however, charging a fee for drinking water, exhibits, roads, overlooks, visitors centers, toilets, picnic tables or boat ramps.

The act also prohibits a charge for boat-launching facilities unless there are specialized facilities provided such as mechanical lifts.

And it prohibits a charge for camp grounds without tent or trailer spaces, drinking water, access roads, refuse containers, toilets, personal collection of the fee, reasonable visitor protection, and devices for containing a camp fire.

Our proposed legislation would repeal the prohibition on fees for specific services to allow us to charge for back country camping and boat launching ramps.

It is not our intention to charge for every drinking fountain, but where several services and facilities are provided in an area, we would charge a user fee.

Regarding the Bureau of Land Management, in 1992 the BLM's recreation fee collections were \$1,671,000 derived from some 96,000 recreation permits for camping and other uses at developed facilities, and from about 4,000 special recreation permits.

The receipts to be collected in 1993 are expected to total \$1.9 million. The expansion of areas at which the Interior Department agencies could collect fees is projected to increase BLM's collection by \$1 million for a total of \$2.95 million, which would meet BLM's goal for recreation fees.

This level of fees is consistent with the President's policies that fees for use of BLM and related lands would not be increased by increments of more than three dollars.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we have included in our proposal an amendment that will enable us to use part of the fees we collect to pay for the costs of collection. This provision will make an estimated \$5 million available in fiscal year 1994 without further appropriation to help pay for fee collection costs.

With this assured source of funds, our park managers will be able to hire more people to collect at the gate during early morning and late evening, and we can fund additional kiosks and other facilities and hardware that will make our collection program more efficient.

We recognize that placing this \$5 million off budget also places a responsibility on our managers of strict accountability for these funds. We accept that responsibility, and we welcome continued oversight by your subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, we believe our fee proposal is a reasonable one, that park visitors will accept as their contribution to providing a Government service.

The service, in this case, is a very special one involving access to and use of some of the finest and most precious real estate in the world.

We think that, viewed in this light, the fees proposed represent an excellent value.

This concludes my prepared remarks, Mr. Chairman. We appreciate your scheduling this hearing this afternoon, and we urge early and favorable consideration of our legislative proposal.

I'd be pleased to respond to any of your questions, and I have my colleagues here from the Fish and Wildlife Service and BLM for specifics.

Mr. VENTO. I'm aware of that, and I appreciate their presence.

Again, I regret the sort of parapathetic in nature of my presence, but let me put this document in the record that you provided us, Mr. Moffitt.

Without objection, that will be placed in the record.

[Prepared statement of Mr. Moffitt follows:]

STATEMENT OF DAVID MOFFITT, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR -- VISITOR
SERVICES, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, FORESTS, AND PUBLIC
LANDS, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, CONCERNING PROPOSED
INCREASED RECREATION FEES.

April 29, 1993

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to provide your Subcommittee with the views of the Department of the Interior on legislation to authorize increased recreation fees and repeal the prohibition on fees for specific services for the National Park System and lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM).

We strongly recommend the enactment of the Administration's proposed legislation that was submitted to the Congress on April 26, 1993.

The President's economic program for fiscal 1994 and beyond proposes the elimination or reduction of certain subsidies and charging of fees for certain services provided by the Government to help bring down the deficit.

In order for the President's economic program to succeed, everyone must contribute, and the increases must be fair and reasonable. Our goal was to increase receipts from recreation fees in fiscal year 1994 as follows: for the National Park Service, \$28.65 million; for the Bureau of Land Management, \$1 million; and for the Fish and Wildlife Service, \$400,000. Our

proposed legislation would achieve that result by increasing statutory caps on certain fees and by expanding the facilities where user fees can be charged. In addition, the BLM would be authorized to charge admission fees at areas identified in section 1 of the bill. The Fish and Wildlife Service can raise its fees sufficiently under current authority to meet its target. Therefore, they are not included in the proposed legislation.

You will note, Mr. Chairman, that we have not recommended repeal of any prohibition that Congress has placed on charging fees for a specific park or classes of parks. If the Congress wishes to do so, and the fee is feasible, we would not object to the removal of exemptions.

We have made available to the Subcommittee our proposed entrance fee schedule for fiscal 1994. Upon enactment of our proposal, and following the required 60-day formal notice to the legislative Committees, these rates will be in effect in time for the calendar 1994 season. The BLM will submit its proposed entrance fee schedule after public review.

Our proposal would increase statutory caps on the Golden Eagle Passport, the annual park pass, and single-visit entry permits. Within the new caps, we intend to phase in the increases over several years. None of the new caps would be reached in 1994.

Specifically, in 1994 we propose to increase the Golden Eagle Passport from \$25 to \$35. This is an annual pass that authorizes entry into any park for a carload or an individual. We anticipate reviewing the value of the passport every 3 or 4 years. If these reviews reveal that the passport is undervalued, a reasonable increase would be proposed, following notification to the Committees. Of course, an increase in the cap could only be accomplished by an Act of Congress.

The annual park pass, which was created in 1986 by Congress to provide unlimited admission for one park for one year, will be increased from \$15 for some parks and \$10 for others to \$20 and \$15 respectively. The new ceiling of \$30 will be reached in increments every 3 or 4 years at the higher fee areas, following appropriate notice.

The single-visit permit, which allows a carload of visitors to stay for seven days, is capped by existing law at \$10 for three parks and \$5 for all other parks. The fee for entry by means other than a vehicle is capped by existing law at \$5 per person for the same three parks and \$3 per person at all others. The three parks with the higher statutory fee caps are Yellowstone, Grand Teton, and Grand Canyon. Our proposal would raise the caps to \$16 per vehicle and \$8 per person for all parks. However, for 1994 no park would carry the maximum fee, and only at 11 parks would we charge \$11 per vehicle and \$5 per person. All others

would carry a lesser charge in fiscal 1994. Again, we anticipate reviewing the value of the single-visit permit every 3 or 4 years.

With regard to park user fees, existing law does not establish statutory caps on fees for such uses as camping. The Act prohibits, however, charging a fee for drinking water, exhibits, roads, overlooks, visitor's centers, toilets, picnic tables, or boat ramps. The Act also prohibits a charge for boat launching facilities unless there are specialized facilities provided such as mechanical lifts, and it prohibits a charge for campgrounds without tent or trailer spaces, drinking water, access roads, refuse containers, toilets, personal collection of the fee, reasonable visitor protection, and devices for containing a campfire.

Our proposed legislation would repeal the prohibitions on fees for specific services, to allow us to charge for backcountry camping and boat launching ramps. It is not our intention to charge for every drinking fountain, but where several services and facilities are provided in an area we could charge a user fee.

Regarding the Bureau of Land Management, in 1992 the BLM's recreation fee collections were \$1,671,000 derived from some 96,000 recreation permits for camping and other uses at developed

facilities and from about 4,000 special recreation permits. The receipts to be collected in 1993 are expected to total \$1.9 million. The expansion of areas at which Interior Department agencies could collect fees is projected to increase BLM's collections by \$1 million to a total of \$2.95 million, which would meet BLM's goal on recreation fees. This level of fees is consistent with the President's policy that fees for use of BLM and related lands would not be increased by increments of more than \$3.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we have included in our proposal an amendment that will enable us to use part of the fees we collect to pay for the costs of collection. This provision will make an estimated \$5 million available in fiscal year 1994, without further appropriation, to help pay for fee-collection costs. With this assured source of funds, our park managers will be able to hire more people to collect at the gate during early morning and late evening, and we can fund additional kiosks and other facilities and hardware that will make our collection program more efficient. We recognize that placing this \$5 million off-budget also places a responsibility on our managers of strict accountability for these funds. We accept that responsibility, and we welcome continued oversight by your Subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, we believe our fee proposal is a reasonable one that park visitors will accept as their contribution to providing

a Government service. The service in this case is a very special one, involving access to and use of some of the finest and most precious real estate in the world. We think that, viewed in this light, the fees proposed represent an excellent value.

This concludes my prepared remarks, Mr. Chairman. We appreciate your scheduling this hearing today, and we urge early and favorable consideration of our legislative proposal. I will be pleased to respond to your questions.

Mr. VENTO. And let me then invite Mr. Mills, I understand neither the BLM nor the Fish and Wildlife Service have statements from the Department of the Interior, but ask your colleague, Associate Deputy Chief Mr. Mills to summarize his statement at this time.

I note that Mr. Boylan has taken the microphone. Is this an indication that Mr. Mills isn't here, Mr. Boylan?

Mr. MILLS. I'm Mr. Mills.

Mr. VENTO. I'm sorry.

Mr. MILLS. The name tags are covered up, so——

Mr. VENTO. I see, sorry.

STATEMENT OF THOMAS J. MILLS

Mr. MILLS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It's a pleasure to be here and testify in support of the Administration's proposal to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, and raise recreation fees on National Forests.

The President's vision for change is a reasoned response to a difficult situation that we face. Recreation demand on National Forests, as elsewhere, is increasing. New facilities have been put in place, and yet we have insufficient operating and maintenance funds to maintain those facilities as they should, the result of which, Mr. Chairman, is that we not only cannot best serve the recreating public, but it puts a considerable capital asset in jeopardy, and it prohibits us from fully protecting the natural resource which in fact the recreationists are coming to see.

This has been a long time in coming, and there's been a number of efforts to address this need for operation maintenance funds, most particularly by increased appropriations by the Congress.

But we've also supplemented those funds with a considerable corps of volunteers, with private sector capital brought in through permits under the Granger-Thye authorities, as well as challenged cost shares that partners have contributed to the development of recreation sites and their operation and maintenance.

It turns out, however, that even with those combined efforts, it's not enough. In 1992, recreation on National Forest lands totalled 287 million recreation visitor days, approximately 40 percent of all the recreation visits on Federal lands.

We expect as many as 80 million recreation visitor days on developed recreational sites alone in 1994.

Although we've got some outstanding new facilities that Congress just funded, such as the Mt. St. Helens Visitor Center, we also have an aging facility infrastructure.

According to a GAO report, over one-quarter of our developed recreation sites are over 40 years old, and three-quarters of them are over 20 years old.

The President's 1994 budget proposes a response to this, with a proposed increase in recreation management funding of some \$12 million. Within those funds, we plan to devote an additional \$1.2 million to the Federal side of the challenged cost-share program that's been so successful in the past, and if our experience in the future matches the past, we'll get more than a one-to-one contribution from non-Federal sources.

But in tight times like these, when tough choices are necessary, it's also necessary then to go to the recreationists and ask them to pay more as well.

Under current authority, we collect some \$15 million in recreation fees. Under this new authority, as it would affect National Forests, we would collect an additional \$10 million for a total of \$25 million.

The proposal, as it affects National Forest lands, has three major components.

The first one is, provide authority to charge admission to national monuments and national volcanic monuments, national scenic areas and areas of concentrated public use, for which there are criteria listed in the proposal.

The increased fees that we would expect to gain from admission to those areas is \$5 million, or approximately half of the \$10 million increase.

It would also remove the amenity requirements that are currently in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, that would permit us to increase fee collections at campgrounds by approximately \$2 million, and other recreation facilities, such as boat ramps and swimming sites, for an additional \$3 million.

The third and last provision that affects National Forest management, just as was testified to earlier, is the authority to retain the administrative costs of collecting these additional fees, which we estimate at this time would be approximately 25 percent.

One of the questions we're often asked is what the recreationists' response to these fee increases would be. I'm sure you'll recall Beverly Driver's testimony on recreation fees just the last session here, before your subcommittee, in which he testified that there are a number of studies that show that a strong majority of recreation users are favorable to reasonable increases in fees, especially providing that those fees are modest increases, that they have paid similar fees in the past, that they are for use of facilities, rather than access to areas, and particularly if they can see that those dollars directly relate to the recreation experience and recreation facilities that they are using.

Therefore, we feel that these fees meet these criteria and that the recreationists will clearly understand the dilemma we face to provide them with the quality recreation experience.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd be happy to answer any questions that you have.

[Prepared statement of Mr. Mills follows:]

STATEMENT OF
THOMAS J. MILLS, ASSOCIATE DEPUTY CHIEF
FOREST SERVICE
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Before the
Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands
Committee on Natural Resources
United States House of Representatives

Concerning proposed amendments to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965.

April 29, 1993

MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE:

Thank you for the opportunity to offer our views in support of the Administration's proposal to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965. We are especially pleased to be testifying in unison with the Department of the Interior on a proposal that will benefit the American public through improvements in the recreation programs of both Departments. We will address the proposal as it relates to the operations of the Department of Agriculture, and defer to the Department of the Interior on the other provisions.

We strongly recommend enactment of the Administration's proposed legislation that was submitted to the Congress on April 26, 1993.

In his report, "A Vision of Change for America", the President made clear his commitment to increasing revenues from users of recreation facilities on Federal lands. We cannot predict exact fee levels, but new entrance and user fees will not exceed the \$3 cap contained in the President's report. This commitment is a reasoned response to a

difficult situation. On the one hand, demand for recreational opportunities is high and expected to grow substantially over the foreseeable future. On the other, available resources are inadequate to maintain even the current recreation infrastructure as is evidenced by the \$449 million unfunded backlog of essential maintenance and repair of recreation facilities. Even so, new facilities are coming on line placing greater stress on the operation and maintenance budget.

Congress has recognized this dilemma and has responded by raising appropriations for the Forest Service recreation program significantly in recent years. To leverage these dollars, we employ a number of innovative measures. For example, in 1991, volunteers contributed work valued at \$23 million in support of the recreation program. Additionally, we operate certain facilities under Granger-Thye permits which bring in private capital to maintain recreation facilities on National Forests. The estimated value of this effort for FY 1991 was \$12 million that was then available for operation and maintenance of other facilities. We have also developed cooperative relationships with over 5000 groups and organizations that contributed \$15 million of private funds or in-kind services in 1992 for recreation management activities helping to alleviate budget shortfalls.

However, if we are to meet the demand for quality recreation opportunities on Federal lands and protect the natural resources from overuse, additional resources beyond these are a must. This Administration has already proposed to spend \$12 million on the reduction of the maintenance and repair backlog through the Natural

Resource Protection and Environmental Infrastructure Initiative that is part of the President's 1994 budget. Also proposed is an additional \$1.2 million for the Forest Service contribution to recreation management projects funded under the Challenge Cost Share program. We continue to believe these resources must be augmented by asking recreation users to bear a slightly greater portion of program costs. Our proposed amendments to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act would do that.

Demand for Recreation Experiences:

Recreation on Federal lands provides important benefits to the American people. Research has clearly demonstrated the physiological and psychological benefits of recreation. Its economic benefits for rural communities are also clearly documented. Increased funding for the recreation program can only enhance these benefits.

The contribution of the Forest Service in meeting the recreation demands of the American public is also well documented. In 1991, 1.6 billion visits were recorded on Federal lands. Forest Service sites accommodated nearly 600 million, or 36 percent, of those visits. The 1989 RPA Assessment projected that national demand for land-based recreation opportunities would rise significantly over the next 50 years, from a low of 30 percent for off-road activities to a high of 193 percent for day hiking. For Fiscal Year 1994, we anticipate that 80 million recreation visitor days will occur on Forest Service developed recreation sites.

Financing the Operation and Maintenance of Recreation Facilities:

The President's budget for FY 1994 proposes \$186 million for recreation management on National Forests of which an estimated \$130 million will be used for operation and maintenance of developed recreation facilities. Under current law, fees collected by the Forest Service from recreationists for use of developed recreation facilities amount to approximately \$15 million dollars, or slightly less than 12 percent of the total cost of operation and maintenance. Research has consistently shown that a strong majority of users are willing to pay reasonable fees provided the fees go toward enhanced recreation experiences. Experience with Duck Stamps, Green Stickers and hunting and fishing licenses support this research. Of course, we must educate the public as to the need for, and use of, increased fees and these increases must be tailored to avoid "sticker shock". Our proposed amendments to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 would generate approximately \$10 million in new receipts. While users are being asked to pay more to recreate on Federal lands, more than 80 percent of program costs for operation and maintenance will continue to be borne by the Federal government.

Increasing the amount of fees collected for recreational activities will enhance user satisfaction by making additional resources available for reduction of the existing maintenance and repair backlog. In 1990, the General Accounting Office (GAO) reported that 51 percent of our developed recreation sites are between 21 and 40 years old, while another 27 percent are more than 40 years old. That means that more than half of the Forest Service recreation facilities

have already outlived their estimated life. Many of these facilities no longer conform to current laws and standards. GAO estimated that, based on conditions found in 1989, \$449 million would be needed to eliminate our maintenance and repair backlog and internal studies suggest the backlog has grown since the GAO study was completed. Additional fees would be available for appropriation to meet a part of this pressing need.

Proposed Changes to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act:

Almost all recreation user fees now collected by the Forest Service come from campgrounds that provide a full array of amenities. Fee levels for specific locations are set by regulation based on comparability with similar recreational facilities in the immediate area. Little additional revenue could be generated by raising fees at these campgrounds.

In order to generate \$10 million in new fees from recreation on National Forests, the Administration proposes several changes in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. First, Section 4(a) would be amended by authorizing the Forest Service to charge admission fees at National Monuments, National Volcanic Monuments, National Scenic Areas, and areas of concentrated public use, in addition to our current admission fee authority for National Recreation Areas. A new subsection, 4(i) would define "areas of concentrated public use" as sites that are managed primarily for outdoor recreation purposes with facilities and services necessary to accommodate heavy public use and that contain at least one major recreation attraction such as a lake,

river, historical site, or geologic feature. These changes are expected to generate \$5 million in new receipts.

Secondly, Section 4(b) would be amended to delete the current requirements that certain facilities be offered at developed recreation sites before recreation use fees can be charged. With this change, daily use fees could be charged at additional developed sites such as camp and picnic grounds, swimming sites, boat launch ramps and managed parking lots, and fees could be charged for specialized services at visitor centers. These sites require specialized facilities and have high operation and maintenance costs because they serve large numbers of people. This change would generate additional receipts of \$3 million from campgrounds and \$2 million from other facilities.

Alternatives to Proposed Legislation:

The realities we face in providing outdoor recreation opportunities to the American public are clear. Demand is up. New facilities are coming on line. At the same time, resources are inadequate to maintain existing recreation facilities. The user represents an important source of added funds to address these needs. Without new fee authority, we would have to eliminate many substandard recreation facilities or, in the alternative, experience a continuing deterioration in their quality. Neither of these options serve the American public well. We believe the Administration's proposal offers an opportunity to maintain the stream of benefits derived from the recreation program without adding to the Federal deficit. It is an

important component of any comprehensive effort to address this situation.

The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 (OBRA) requires that all revenue and direct spending legislation meet a Pay-As-You-Go (PAYGO) requirement. The Administration's proposal would increase receipts by approximately \$10 million in FY 1994. Thus, the bill meets the PAYGO requirement of the OBRA.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my remarks. I would be glad to answer any questions from you or the other Members of the Subcommittee.

Mr. VENTO. Yes, I have a question. We've got to go for a vote here in another eight minutes or so.

But I thought we'd get something done today before I have to retreat to mark up the Resolution Trust Corporation Funding Bill in the other Committee.

My question, Mr. Mills and Mr. Moffitt, and others with the Department of the Interior—Mr. Marsh and Mr. Boylan—is, you asked, in terms of collecting fees, to have the authority to deduct the expense of collecting the fees.

That would also apply to the existing user entrants, or as Mr. Mills referred to them, recreation fees. So you completely confused me.

But, in any case, can you give me any estimate. I mean, for instance, Mr. Mills, you said, combined here, you assume you can collect another \$10 million if we change these criteria under LWCF, the eight criteria to no criteria.

So you'd have an extra \$10 million. What would we—in other words, you're already collecting \$15 million, but we would then deduct from that what the cost of collection is, and we would deduct from the cost of collection, the \$10 million.

Is that \$10 million the estimate of what we'd get with the deduction?

Mr. MILLS. As I understand our proposal, Mr. Chairman, the authority is to withhold the administrative costs of collecting apply to the additional fees collected, therefore not to the existing \$15 million approximately which we currently collect.

Mr. VENTO. It would be quite an accounting fete.

Mr. MILLS. It would definitely be an accounting challenge for us, yes.

Mr. VENTO. How would you interpret the changed criteria for LWCF as being an increased fee, and therefore subject to the withholding of expenses, or not?

Mr. MILLS. It would not be easy, Mr. Chairman, but in our attempt to make this budget neutral so it would follow the PAYGO requirements, we feel we've already got the administrative costs included in our regular appropriations to cover the cost of collecting the existing fee.

Mr. VENTO. I expect what would evolve is that the fees, I think down the road, is there's less attention devoted to this.

I just think probably to be realistic right off the bat to say that we're going to begin this policy, wouldn't it be appropriate to just carry it through.

If we're going to do it, to do it and have it apply to all of the fees.

Mr. MILLS. Yes, sir, that certainly would be much more simplified in an accounting sense. Yes, sir.

Mr. VENTO. Does anyone else have any comments on the impact of this on the revenues or not?

Mr. Moffitt? You want to add a word or two?

Mr. MOFFITT. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

We calculate that by being able to deduct the costs of collection, we will add an additional \$10 to \$12 million without counting the new fees or the new caps.

Mr. VENTO. Can you give me some insight as to why the deduction of this is going to be a better philosophy?

Mr. MOFFITT. Well, we feel that we can hold our managers more accountable if we do supply them with this money for the costs of collection. It will also allow us to expand our hours. At some of our parks, our entrance stations are only open eight hours a day, and we would hope that by being able to recoup the costs, we could stay open for 12 to 15 hours a day, which naturally then increases our revenue.

Mr. VENTO. And there are ancillary benefits too. Don't forget the ancillary benefits.

Mr. MOFFITT. Very definitely.

Mr. VENTO. Of the presence of the Park Service or the land manager at that entrance gate.

The Chairman's been running around telling a story about the fact that he visited one of your parks, and there was no one there to collect it when he went in, and there was no one there—there was someone there to collect it when he went out, and they told him just to keep driving, that they'd get him next time.

Mr. MOFFITT. Unfortunately, that's not rare.

Mr. VENTO. Now one of the other aspects here, and I think this probably is applicable to Mr. Boylan or Mr. Marsh, do you have anything to add to that user fee or the deduction of collection expenses?

Mr. MARSH. Only that it would help offset our base of funding in other areas. Our costs of collection are now a disincentive and they're running too high, probably 40 percent. So if we collected a million dollars at the current rate of collection, it would probably cost us \$400,000, because of the remoteness of facilities and lack of people to collect those fees.

But we probably could offset the current cost of collection if they were returned.

Mr. VENTO. Do you have a list of areas where you charge entrance fees at BLM areas, Mr. Marsh?

Mr. MARSH. No, sir, I do not at this time.

Mr. VENTO. Would you supply that for us in the next few days?

Mr. MARSH. Yes, sir. We have some data that's approximately a year old, I have with me, but we can, sure.

Mr. VENTO. That would probably give us the idea of where we charge fees.

I don't think you charge entrance fees?

Mr. MARSH. No, we're not allowed to charge entrance fees.

Mr. VENTO. You're not allowed to charge entrance fees.

Would you give us an area where you propose to charge entrance fees?

[The information follows:]

If the Bureau of Land Management were given the authority to charge entrance fees, we would propose to charge entrance or admission fees where significant recreation services are provided the visiting public in order to cover the administrative and maintenance costs of these facilities. Here are some examples of where we would charge entrance fees:

Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Area and Visitor Center, Las Vegas, Nevada

National Historic Oregon Trail Interpretive Center (Flagstaff Hill), Baker City, Oregon

Yaquina Head Outstanding Natural Area and proposed interpretive center, Newport, Oregon

Anasazi Heritage Center, Dolores, Colorado

Highly developed recreation sites, such as, San Pedro Riparian National Conservation Area, Arizona; Aquirre Springs and Wild Rivers, New Mexico; Loon Lake, Wildwood, Fisherman's Bend in Oregon; and Grand Gulch, Little Sahara, Cleveland-Lloyd Dinosaur Quarry, Jarvie Historic Ranch in Utah.

Mr. VENTO. You must be providing some information for the Congressional Budget Office if you're scoring the amount of revenue. In order to score it, we'll have to have some numbers at some point. You'd have to have some numbers.

Mr. MARSH. We're currently collecting about \$1.9 million in recreation fees this year, and we believe we could, our professional guesstimate, collect at least half again of that amount, with the relaxed campground criteria in the bill and the authority to charge entrance fees.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Boylan, in terms of the offsetting expenses being utilized for the Fish and Wildlife Service?

Mr. BOYLAN. Yes, Mr. Chairman. That could be a benefit, but we've already received, we're under a little bit different legislation, under the Emergency Wetlands Resources Act, 30 percent of the fees that are collected go to defray refuge collections, and 70 percent to the Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Fund.

No doubt, any other fees that would be returned to us would benefit refuges.

Mr. VENTO. Sounds like you're getting—is that adequate to pay for the costs, 30 percent?

Mr. BOYLAN. No, it's not. There's still, it defrays the expenses but it doesn't cover them.

Mr. VENTO. Well, you know, I think it points out, at least, and there may be some unique differences here, this idea of collecting or reducing is interesting.

You know, the Inspector General, as I pointed out, Mr. Moffitt, made a criticism of saying that the Park Service collected an extra \$105 million if you put your mind to it here.

Did you have any comments on that?

Mr. MOFFITT. We have not completed our review of the Inspector General's report, Mr. Chairman. However, we do feel that the \$105 million is, we don't agree to \$105 million. Preliminary estimates, we think maybe he's correct up to \$60 million, which is significant, and a lot of that is due to lack of staffing and inefficiencies in our program which our proposal will help alleviate.

Mr. VENTO. Sixty million additional dollars?

Mr. MOFFITT. Yes, sir.

Mr. VENTO. So I mean without, with simply the change in terms of the LWCF change and the deduction of expenses—

Mr. MOFFITT. That's not all that's involved, no, sir.

Mr. VENTO. Well, no. I mean, you obviously have increased fees in some parks too.

Mr. MOFFITT. Some of this, the \$105 million that was quoted in the Inspector General's report, 55 of the parks mentioned do not charge entrance fees now. So they would have to, a lot of those probably should be entrance fee parks. For some various reasons we don't have them, but a lot of them, most of them are probably more appropriately users fee parks.

Mr. VENTO. Let me just kind of accelerate things here. I have to leave in a few minutes, and I don't want to hold the members here, or the Administration witnesses.

I regret that other members did not come back over. You might want to wait until I return to see what they do. It would probably be a good idea, because Mr. Thomas may have questions and did appear here earlier.

But one question that, first of all, last year had a rather comprehensive proposal on America The Beautiful which tried to coordinate a lot of the fees and so forth.

That isn't here today.

Am I right in judging that the new Administration has simply not evaluated that thoroughly and therefore is not presenting it, and rather has this more modest proposal because of that, Mr. Moffitt?

Mr. MOFFITT. I really am not sure where the Administration or the Department stands on this completely, Mr. Chairman.

The National Park Service, in its own interests, has recommended against it to the Department. There's not unanimity within the Department of the Interior, and obviously we have a very successful program going with the Golden Eagle Passport, and we're looking at it rather parochially.

Mr. VENTO. I see. That's interesting.

Mr. Mills, any comments on that issue?

Mr. MILLS. You are correct, sir, that what we have here is a more modest proposal. We do see some benefits to a passport idea, especially if that passport could be a vehicle for contributions to the management of the National Forest recreation sites.

Mr. VENTO. Well, I'm kind of concerned about, you know, for the types of changes being made here.

I think in looking at the LWCF changes, Mr. Moffitt, you said that if we eliminated the criteria that you would not be charging where there is simply a water fountain?

Mr. MILLS. That's correct.

Mr. VENTO. But why should we completely wipe them out? Shouldn't we expect substantial compliance with half of them, or more than half?

Wouldn't that be of a significant benefit?

Mr. MILLS. Basically what we would like, Mr. Chairman, is not to have a requirement that all eight are met.

Mr. VENTO. Let me stop you at that point, because I've got to go vote, and we will return.

There may be a second vote following, but in any case, it shouldn't take more than ten or 15 minutes, so we'll be in recess pending the voting on the floor.

[Recess.]

Mr. VENTO. The subcommittee will resume its sitting.

I would suggest that we could submit some questions in writing, but I'm concerned about the likelihood that they would not be back timely.

So I would only say, I would ask permission to submit questions in writing, especially under the circumstances, with so many members who would like to have heard the witnesses have not been able to appear because of the voting on the floor.

But I would just ask that the questions must have a pretty short turnaround in terms of time.

And so I don't know if you can accommodate that, Mr. Moffitt, Mr. Marsh, Mr. Boylan, and Mr. Mills, but I would appreciate it if you would try.

Mr. MILLS. We will, sir.

Mr. VENTO. In light of that, there are a series of questions. I'm reminded of one of my protege's remarks, Mr. Burton, who said that, you know, the people have paid for these units once, they shouldn't have to pay for them twice. But there is the admonition dealing with user fees as opposed to entrance.

Mr. Mills, you've listed the types of areas that you would in fact charge fees at. Is that a specific list then, that you would, at all of these scenic areas, at all of these recreation areas, and so forth, you would be charging entrance fees?

Is that the intention?

Mr. MILLS. No, sir. The intention is not to charge at all those areas. In coming up with the \$5 million estimate that I mentioned earlier for volcanic monuments, as well as areas of concentrated public use, there's some list of 41 areas, about half of which are designated areas, like monuments.

Mr. VENTO. Do you have such a list? Is it attached here? Have we received such a list?

Mr. MILLS. We would be happy to give you a list, based upon the estimates that we have made at this time.

[The information follows:]

Table 14—National Recreation Areas by State

| <i>State</i> | <i>Recreation Areas Unit name</i> | <i>NFS acreage</i> | <i>Other acreage</i> | <i>Total acreage</i> |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| California | | | | |
| | Smith River | | | |
| | Six Rivers NF | 305,169 | 26,060 | 331,229 |
| | Whiskeytown Shasta-Trinity | | | |
| | Shasta NF | 141,165 | 19,642 | 160,807 |
| | Trinity NF | 35,202 | 7,578 | 42,780 |
| | State total | 481,536 | 53,280 | 534,816 |
| Colorado | | | | |
| | Arapaho | | | |
| | Arapaho NF | 30,687 | 4,241 | 34,928 |
| | State total | 30,687 | 4,241 | 34,928 |
| Idaho | | | | |
| | Hells Canyon | | | |
| | Nez Perce NF | 103,660 | 440 | 104,100 |
| | Payette NF | 29,211 | 0 | 29,211 |
| | Wallowa NF * | 3,208 | 2,346 | 5,554 |
| | Sawtooth | | | |
| | Boise NF | 155,984 | 0 | 155,984 |
| | Challis NF | 253,863 | 8,899 | 262,762 |
| | Sawtooth NF * | 319,475 | 17,798 | 337,273 |
| | State total | 865,401 | 29,483 | 894,884 |
| Michigan | | | | |
| | Grand Island | | | |
| | Hiawatha NF | 12,957 | 0 | 12,957 |
| | State total | 12,957 | 0 | 12,957 |
| Montana | | | | |
| | Battlesnake | | | |
| | Lolo NF | 59,119 | 1,881 | 61,000 |
| | State total | 59,119 | 1,881 | 61,000 |
| Nebraska | | | | |
| | Pine Ridge | | | |
| | Nebraska NF | 6,600 | 0 | 6,600 |
| | State total | 6,600 | 0 | 6,600 |
| Oklahoma | | | | |
| | Winding Stair Mountain | | | |
| | Ouachita NF * | 25,890 | 555 | 26,445 |
| | State total | 25,890 | 555 | 26,445 |

Table 14—National Recreation Areas by State

| State Recreation Areas Unit name | NFS acreage | Other acreage | Total acreage |
|--|----------------|------------------|------------------|
| Oregon | | | |
| Hells Canyon | | | |
| Wallowa NF * | 355,109 | 0 | 355,109 |
| Whitman NF | 45,460 | 1,902 | 47,362 |
| Oregon Dunes | | | |
| Siuslaw NF | 25,698 | 5,868 | 31,566 |
| State total | 426,267 | 7,770 | 434,037 |
| Pennsylvania | | | |
| Allegheny | | | |
| Allegheny NF | 23,063 | 0 | 23,063 |
| State total | 23,063 | 0 | 23,063 |
| Utah | | | |
| Flaming Gorge | | | |
| Ashley NF * | 94,308 | 2,105 | 96,413 |
| State total | 94,308 | 2,105 | 96,413 |
| Vermont | | | |
| White Rocks | | | |
| Green Mountain NF | 36,400 | 0 | 36,400 |
| State total | 36,400 | 0 | 36,400 |
| Virginia | | | |
| Mount Rogers | | | |
| Jefferson NF * | 112,566 | 42,250 | 154,816 |
| State total | 112,566 | 42,250 | 154,816 |
| Washington | | | |
| Mount Baker | | | |
| Mt. Baker NF | 8,473 | 0 | 8,473 |
| State total | 8,473 | 0 | 8,473 |
| West Virginia | | | |
| Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks | | | |
| Monongahela NF | 56,968 | 43,032 | 100,000 |
| State total | 56,968 | 43,032 | 100,000 |
| Wyoming | | | |
| Flaming Gorge | | | |
| Ashley NF * | 95,517 | 9,184 | 104,701 |
| State total | 95,517 | 9,184 | 104,701 |
| Grand total | 2,335,752 | 193,781 | 2,529,533 |

Table 15--National Recreation Areas in Multiple States

| Recreation Area State Unit name | NFS acreage | Other acreage | Total acreage |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|
| Flaming Gorge | | | |
| Utah | | | |
| Ashley NF * | 94,308 | 2,105 | 96,413 |
| Wyoming | | | |
| Ashley NF * | 95,517 | 9,184 | 104,701 |
| Total for area | 189,825 | 11,289 | 201,114 |
| Hells Canyon | | | |
| Idaho | | | |
| Nez Perce NF | 103,860 | 440 | 104,100 |
| Payette NF | 29,211 | 0 | 29,211 |
| Wallowa NF * | 3,208 | 2,346 | 5,554 |
| Oregon | | | |
| Wallowa NF * | 355,109 | 0 | 355,109 |
| Whitman NF | 45,460 | 1,902 | 47,362 |
| Total for area | 536,648 | 4,688 | 541,336 |

NAT'L SCENIC AREA

Cascade Head (Oregon) 6619 3051 9670
 Siuslaw NF

Table 17—National Monument Areas by State

| <i>State</i> <i>National Monument</i> <i>Unit name</i> | <i>NFS</i> <i>acreage</i> | <i>Other</i> <i>acreage</i> | <i>Total</i> <i>acreage</i> |
|--|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Alaska | | | |
| Admiralty Island | | | |
| Tongass NF | 955,810 | 32,161 | 987,971 |
| Misty Fjords | | | |
| Tongass NF | 2,293,428 | 1,311 | 2,294,739 |
| State total | 3,249,238 | 33,472 | 3,282,710 |
| Grand total | 3,249,238 | 33,472 | 3,282,710 |

Table 18—National Volcanic Monument Areas by State

| <i>State</i> <i>National Volcanic Monument</i> <i>Unit name</i> | <i>NFS</i> <i>acreage</i> | <i>Other</i> <i>acreage</i> | <i>Total</i> <i>acreage</i> |
|---|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Oregon | | | |
| Newberry ** | | | |
| Deschutes NF | 54,822 | 678 | 55,500 |
| State total | 54,822 | 678 | 55,500 |
| Washington | | | |
| Mount St. Helens ** | | | |
| Gifford Pinchot NF | 80,498 | 30,530 | 111,028 |
| State total | 80,498 | 30,530 | 111,028 |
| Grand total | 135,320 | 31,208 | 166,528 |

Table 19—National Historic Areas by State

| <i>State</i> <i>National Historic Area</i> <i>Unit name</i> | <i>NFS</i> <i>acreage</i> | <i>Other</i> <i>acreage</i> | <i>Total</i> <i>acreage</i> |
|---|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| North Carolina | | | |
| Cradle of Forestry | | | |
| Pisgah NF | 6,540 | 0 | 6,540 |
| State total | 6,540 | 0 | 6,540 |
| Grand total | 6,540 | 0 | 6,540 |

National Forest System "Developed Recreation Complexes"
Members of Congress

| <u>State</u> | <u>National Forest</u> | <u>Complex</u> |
|--------------|------------------------|--------------------------|
| AZ | Coronado | Sabino Canyon |
| | Coronado | Bear Canyon |
| | Tonto | Lower Salt River |
| CA | Angeles | Big Tujunga Canyon |
| | Cleveland | Corral Canyon |
| | San Bernardino | Jenks Lake |
| CO | Arapaho-Roosevelt | Brainard Lake |
| | Pike | Rampart Motorcycle |
| | San Isabel | Cottonwood Lake |
| | San Isabel | O'Haver Lake |
| MO | Mark Twain | Chadwick Motorcycle |
| MT | Lolo | Seeley Lake |
| NH | White Mountain | Tuckerman Ravine |
| NM | Carson | Hopewell Lake |
| OR | Siuslaw | Sand Lake All-Terrain |
| | Siuslaw | Horsfall All-Terrain |
| | Rogue River | Applegate Reservoir |
| UT | Unita | Current Creek |
| | Unita | Soldier Creek |
| | Unita | Strawberry Bay |
| WA | Wenatchee | Lake Kachess |

Mr. VENTO. Yes, I would appreciate that.

And the Fish and Wildlife Service, do you have a specific list or changes where you would in fact be charging fees, Mr. Boylan?

Mr. BOYLAN. Yes, Mr. Chairman. We're preparing a federal notice to go out to expand our receipts, the areas that would be charging. And we would have, under the new—well, at present, we have 61 units that are charging entrance and/or user fees including 11 entrance fees, 37 user fees, 12 that collect both.

In 1994, it would go up to 70 units, and we have projected which ones those would be and what the charges would be. And we'd be happy to provide those to you.

[The information follows:]

DRAFT

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

New And Increased Public Recreation Entrance and User Fees
At Certain Units Of The National Wildlife Refuge System

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior

ACTION: Notice

SUMMARY: In order to provide additional revenues for the operation and maintenance of the National Wildlife Refuge System (Refuge System) and the conservation of wetland resources, the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) may authorize the establishment and collection of public recreation entrance and user fee charges at units of the Refuge System.

Accordingly, notice is hereby given of the intent of the Service to initiate new and increased public recreation entrance and user fee charges at certain units of the Refuge System effective October 1, 1993.

DATES: Comments must be received within 30 days following publication of this Notice.

ADDRESSES: Address comments to Assistant Director-Refuges and Wildlife, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Room 3248, 1849 C Street, NW., Washington, D.C., 20240

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joseph Brendan Murphy, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Refuges, 1849 C Street, NW., MS 670 ARLSQ, Washington, D.C., 20240; Telephone (703-358-1786).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: All (100%) of the public recreation fee revenues generated will be utilized to help fund the operation, maintenance and the expansion of the Refuge System.

Thirty percent (30%) of the fee revenues generated will be utilized first to defray the cost of collection, then for the operation and maintenance of the collecting refuge unit, and then for the operation and maintenance costs of all units of the Refuge System.

Seventy percent (70%) of the fee revenues generated will be deposited into the Migratory Bird Conservation Fund, established under section 4 of the Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act (16 U.S.C.718d), and utilized by the Service to help expand the Refuge System.

DRAFT

The authority to establish and collect public recreation entrance and user fees at units of the Refuge System is contained in Public Law 99-645, the Emergency Wetlands Resources Act of 1986 (16 U.S.C. 3911) and Public Law 88-578, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1964 (16 U.S.C 4601-4/4601-11).

NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM
NEW AND INCREASED PUBLIC RECREATION ENTRANCE FEES

| <u>National Wildlife Refuge (NWR)</u> | <u>Fiscal Year 1993</u> | <u>Fiscal Year 1994</u> |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Region 4 - Arkansas, Florida, Georgia | | |
| Holla Bend NWR | | |
| Russellville, Arkansas | | |
| * Individual | \$ 1.00 | \$ 1.00 |
| * Vehicle | \$ 3.00 | \$ 4.00 |
| Arthur R. Marshall Loxahatchee NWR | | |
| Boynton Beach, Florida | | |
| * Individual | \$ 1.00 | \$ 1.00 |
| * Vehicle | \$ 3.00 | \$ 4.00 |
| Hobe Sound NWR | | |
| Boynton Beach, Florida | | |
| * Individual | \$ 1.00 | \$ 1.00 |
| * Vehicle | \$ 3.00 | \$ 4.00 |
| Saint Marks NWR | | |
| Saint Marks, Florida | | |
| * Individual | \$ 1.00 | \$ 1.00 |
| * Vehicle | \$ 3.00 | \$ 4.00 |
| Okefenokee NWR | | |
| Folkston, Georgia | | |
| * Individual | \$ 1.00 | \$ 1.00 |
| * Vehicle | \$ 3.00 | \$ 4.00 |
| Region 5 - Delaware, Maryland, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Virginia | | |
| Bombay Hook NWR | | |
| Smyrna, Delaware | | |
| * Individual | \$ 1.00 | \$ 2.00 |
| * Vehicle | \$ 3.00 | \$ 4.00 |
| Blackwater NWR | | |
| Cambridge, Maryland | | |
| * Individual | \$ 1.00 | \$ 2.00 |
| * Vehicle | \$ 3.00 | \$ 4.00 |

DRAFT

Parker River NWR
Newburyport, Massachusetts

| | | |
|--------------|---------|---------|
| * Individual | \$ 1.00 | \$ 2.00 |
| * Vehicle | \$ 5.00 | \$ 5.00 |

Target Rock NWR
Shirley, New York

| | | |
|--------------|---------|---------|
| * Individual | \$ 1.00 | \$ 2.00 |
| * Vehicle | \$ 3.00 | \$ 4.00 |

Edwin B. Forsythe NWR
Oceanville, New Jersey

| | | |
|--------------|---------|---------|
| * Individual | \$ 1.00 | \$ 2.00 |
| * Vehicle | \$ 3.00 | \$ 4.00 |

Back Bay NWR
Virginia Beach, Virginia

| | | |
|--------------|---------|---------|
| * Individual | \$ 1.00 | \$ 2.00 |
| * Vehicle | \$ 3.00 | \$ 4.00 |

Chincoteague NWR
Chincoteague, Virginia

| | | |
|--------------|---------|---------|
| * Individual | - 0 - | - 0 - |
| * Vehicle | \$ 3.00 | \$ 4.00 |

Region 6 - Montana

National Bison Range NWR
Moiese, Montana

| | | |
|--------------|-------|---------|
| * Individual | - 0 - | - 0 - |
| * Vehicle | - 0 - | \$ 4.00 |

DRAFT

NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM
NEW AND INCREASED PUBLIC RECREATION USER FEES

| <u>National Wildlife Refuge (NWR)</u> | <u>Fiscal Year</u> <u>1993</u> | <u>Fiscal Year</u> <u>1994</u> |
|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Region 1 - California, Oregon, Washington | | |
| Lower Klamath NWR | | |
| Tulelake, California | | |
| * Controlled Waterfowl Hunt | | |
| Application | - 0 - | - 0 |
| Permit | - 0 - | \$10.00 |
| Tule Lake NWR | | |
| Tulelake, California | | |
| * Waterfowl Hunting Blind | | |
| Application | - 0 - | - 0- |
| Permit | - 0 - | \$10.00 |
| Tule Lake NWR | | |
| Tulelake, California | | |
| * Controlled Waterfowl Hunt | | |
| Application | - 0 - | - 0 - |
| Permit | - 0 - | \$10.00 |
| Modoc NWR | | |
| Alturas, California | | |
| * Controlled Waterfowl Hunt | | |
| Application | - 0 - | - 0 - |
| Permit | - 0 - | \$10.00 |
| McKay Creek NWR | | |
| Pendleton, Oregon | | |
| * Controlled Hunt | | |
| Application | - 0 - | \$ 2.00 |
| Permit | - 0 - | - 0 - |
| Umatilla NWR, McCormack Slough Unit | | |
| Umatilla, Oregon | | |
| * Waterfowl Hunting Blind | | |
| Application | - 0 - | \$ 2.00 |
| Permit | \$10.00 | \$10.00 |
| McNary NWR | | |
| Burbank, Washington | | |
| * Waterfowl Hunting Blind | | |
| Application | - 0 - | \$ 2.00 |
| Permit | - 0 - | - 0 - |

DRAFT

Region 2 - California, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas

| | | |
|-----------------------------|---------|---------|
| Cibola NWR | | |
| Blythe, California | | |
| * Controlled Waterfowl Hunt | | |
| Application | - 0 - | - 0 - |
| Permit | \$ 5.00 | \$10.00 |
| Havasut NWR | | |
| Needles, California | | |
| * Controlled Waterfowl Hunt | | |
| Application | - 0 - | - 0 - |
| Permit | \$ 5.00 | \$10.00 |
| Salt Plains NWR | | |
| Jet, Oklahoma | | |
| * Controlled Deer Hunt | | |
| Application | - 0 - | - 0 - |
| Permit | \$15.00 | \$20.00 |
| Tishomingo NWR | | |
| Tishomingo, Oklahoma | | |
| * Controlled Deer Hunt | | |
| Application | - 0 - | - 0 - |
| Permit | \$15.00 | \$20.00 |
| Anahuac NWR | | |
| Anahuac, Texas | | |
| * Controlled Waterfowl Hunt | | |
| Application | - 0 - | - 0 - |
| Permit | \$ 5.00 | \$10.00 |
| McFaddin NWR | | |
| Sabine Pass, Texas | | |
| * Controlled Waterfowl Hunt | | |
| Application | - 0 - | - 0 - |
| Permit | \$ 5.00 | \$10.00 |
| Aransas NWR | | |
| Austwell, Texas | | |
| * Controlled Deer Hunt | | |
| Application | - 0 - | - 0 - |
| Permit | \$15.00 | \$20.00 |
| San Bernard NWR | | |
| Brazoria, Texas | | |
| * Controlled Waterfowl Hunt | | |
| Application | - 0 - | - 0 - |
| Permit | \$ 5.00 | \$10.00 |

DRAFT

Buffalo NWR
 Umbarger, Texas
 * Controlled Upland Game Hunt
 Application
 Permit

- 0 - - 0 -
 - 0 - \$10.00

Hagerman NWR
 Sherman, Texas
 * Controlled Deer Hunt
 Application
 Permit

- 0 - - 0 -
 \$15.00 \$20.00

Laguna Atascosa NWR
 Rio Hondo, Texas
 * Controlled Deer Hunt
 Application
 Permit

- 0 - - 0 -
 \$15.00 \$20.00

Region 3 - Michigan

Shiawassee NWR
 Saginaw, Michigan
 * Controlled Deer Hunt
 Application
 Permit

- 0 - - 0 -
 - 0 - \$10.00

Region 4 - Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, Mississippi

Eufaula NWR
 Eufaula, Alabama
 * Controlled Deer Hunt
 Application
 Permit

- 0 - \$ 5.00
 \$10.00 \$10.00

White River NWR
 De Witt, Arkansas
 * Controlled Deer Hunt
 Application
 Permit

- 0 - \$ 5.00
 \$10.00 \$10.00

Felsenthal NWR
 Crossett, Arkansas
 * Controlled Deer Hunt
 Application
 Permit

- 0 - \$ 5.00
 \$10.00 \$10.00

Lake Woodruff NWR
 DeLeon Springs, Florida
 * Controlled Deer Hunt
 Application
 Permit

- 0 - \$ 5.00
 \$10.00 \$10.00

DRAFT

Lower Suwannee NWR
 Chiefland, Florida
 * Controlled Deer Hunt
 Application
 Permit

- 0 - \$ 5.00
 \$10.00 \$10.00

Saint Vincent NWR
 Apalachicola, Florida
 * Controlled Deer Hunt
 Application
 Permit

- 0 - \$ 5.00
 \$10.00 \$10.00

Saint Marks NWR
 Saint Marks, Florida
 * Controlled Deer Hunt
 Application
 Permit

- 0 - \$ 5.00
 \$10.00 \$10.00

Savannah Coastal NWR
 Savannah, Georgia
 * Controlled Deer Hunt
 Application
 Permit

- 0 - \$ 5.00
 \$10.00 \$10.00

Piedmont NWR
 Round Oak, Georgia
 * Controlled Deer Hunt
 Application
 Permit

- 0 - \$ 5.00
 \$10.00 \$10.00

Okefenokee NWR
 Folkston, Georgia
 * Controlled Deer Hunt
 Application
 Permit

- 0 - \$ 5.00
 \$10.00 \$10.00

Okefenokee NWR
 Folkston, Georgia
 * Developed Campsites
 Application
 Permit

- 0 - - 0 -
 \$ 3.00 \$ 4.00

Tensas River NWR
 Tallulah, Louisiana
 * Controlled Deer Hunt
 Application
 Permit

- 0 - \$ 5.00
 \$10.00 \$10.00

Noxubee NWR
 Brooksville, Mississippi
 * Controlled Deer Hunt
 Application
 Permit

- 0 - \$ 5.00
 \$10.00 \$10.00

DRAFT

Yazoo NWR
 Hollandale, Mississippi
 * Controlled Deer Hunt
 Application
 Permit

- 0 - \$ 5.00
 \$10.00 \$10.00

Mattamuskeet NWR
 Swanquarter, North Carolina
 * Controlled Deer Hunt
 Application
 Permit

- 0 - \$ 5.00
 \$10.00 \$10.00

Mackay Island NWR
 Knotts Island, North Carolina
 * Controlled Deer Hunt
 Application
 Permit

- 0 - \$ 5.00
 \$10.00 \$10.00

Pee Dee NWR
 Wadesboro, North Carolina
 * Controlled Deer Hunt
 Application
 Permit

- 0 - \$ 5.00
 \$10.00 \$10.00

Pocosin Lakes NWR
 Creswell, North Carolina
 * Controlled Deer Hunt
 Application
 Permit

- 0 - \$ 5.00
 \$10.00 \$10.00

Hatchie NWR
 Brownsville, Tennessee
 * Controlled Deer Hunt
 Application
 Permit

- 0 - \$ 5.00
 \$10.00 \$10.00

Reelfoot NWR
 Union City, Tennessee
 * Controlled Deer Hunt
 Application
 Permit

- 0 - \$ 5.00
 \$10.00 \$10.00

Tennessee NWR
 Paris, Tennessee
 * Controlled Deer Hunt
 Application
 Permit

- 0 - \$ 5.00
 \$10.00 \$10.00

Region 7 - Alaska

Kenai NWR
 Soldotna, Alaska
 * Hidden Lake Developed Campground
 Daily Rate

\$ 6.00 \$10.00

DRAFT

Kenai NWR
Soldotna, Alaska
* Upper Skilak Developed Campground
Daily Rates
Walk In Sites
Drive In Sites

| | |
|-------|---------|
| - 0 - | \$ 6.00 |
| - 0 - | \$10.00 |

Director, United States Fish and Wildlife Service

Date

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Moffitt and the others, we're talking about extending, there's a prohibition on charging for boat launches. Can you explain the nuance if it is actually a mechanical boat launch, there is no fee charged now.

If it's motorized and so forth, a powered boat launch, then there is a fee. Is that correct?

Mr. MOFFITT. That's correct, sir.

Mr. VENTO. And do you have any idea of what the impact of some of these changes would be, such as that boat launch issue?

Mr. MOFFITT. We estimate that we could collect an additional \$3.5 million at boat ramps that we presently do not, are prohibited from charging.

Mr. VENTO. I expect this would be a big item for the Corps of Engineers too, who I did not pursue that question with, in the sense of their recreation sites.

For others at the table, Mr. Mills, Mr. Boylan, Mr. Marsh, what would the impact of this particular boat launch change be?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, on National Forests, we estimate that removing this prohibition on boat launches would generate an increase of some \$350,000 to \$400,000.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Boylan, do you have such figures?

Mr. BOYLAN. We don't have the exact figures, Mr. Chairman. We have relatively few boat launches right now. Most of our fees, most of our user fees result from hunting programs.

Mr. VENTO. You'd have the discretion, obviously, to put in these fees, but in other instances, where you have duplicative fees, for instance, entrance fees for entering the park and other factors, Mr. Moffitt, would that affect the user fees, or would they be put in place no matter what the situation was, in terms of how these fees work together cumulatively?

Mr. MOFFITT. They'd be independent, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VENTO. I'm concerned about the overall impact. For instance, at Glen Canyon, you have no user fee or no entrance fee charged there, as far as I know.

Is that correct?

Mr. MOFFITT. That's correct.

Mr. VENTO. And you have a boat launch there, ramp and parking for which you don't charge. The intent would be to charge there in that particular case.

Is that correct?

Mr. MOFFITT. Yes.

Mr. VENTO. In other areas, you might have similar types of facilities, such as at Yellowstone, and you may have a lake there, I don't know.

The point is, you already have a charge of ten dollars to get in, and you're proposing to raise it to \$16, I believe. So my point is that if you had already paid a \$16 charge for entrance, would there be a consideration of whether or not you would in fact cumulatively then go on to charge the other fee?

In other words, do you have the discretion to charge this in some areas, but not at others? At Yellowstone Lake versus at Glen Canyon?

I'm trying to talk about the cumulative effect. You have the discretion to put the user fee in effect, not the mandate?

Is that correct?

Mr. MOFFITT. That is correct.

Mr. VENTO. So you would take factors into consideration that might be different.

Mr. MOFFITT. That's correct.

Mr. VENTO. At different sites, where there is no—you understand what I'm saying?

Mr. MOFFITT. Yes, sir. We would use our discretion there.

We do, in some instances, have both now.

Mr. VENTO. You do have both now?

Mr. MOFFITT. In some parks, yes, sir.

Mr. VENTO. Yes. Well, of course now you're only doing it for an act of motorized type of a launch as opposed to a mechanical type where you just back up where you've got a blacktop apron that meets the shore of the lake.

Mr. MOFFITT. Yes, sir. Our intention is not to nickel and dime the visitor.

Mr. VENTO. Well, I'm afraid the impression that one might get, I can see circumstances where that would not be the impression that was left by virtue of this.

In any case, I have a series of other questions, and I think other members may have some additional questions.

But let me, at this time, then, excuse as witnesses, and we will submit some of the questions in writing.

Thank you very much gentlemen, for your testimony.

Mr. MOFFITT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

PANEL CONSISTING OF WILLIAM J. CHANDLER, CONSERVATION DIRECTOR, NATIONAL PARKS AND CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION; KATHRYN HOHMANN, WASHINGTON DIRECTOR, PUBLIC LANDS PROGRAM, SIERRA CLUB; AND JIM BENSBERG, VICE CHAIRMAN, TASK FORCE ON RECREATION FEES, AMERICAN RECREATION COALITION, SPEAKING FOR ROBERT RASOR, ACCOMPANIED BY AMY MANN, DIRECTOR, SPORTS AND RECREATION, AMERICAN HORSE COUNCIL

Mr. VENTO. Let me call the remaining panel of witnesses, private sector witnesses.

Mr. Bill Chandler, the Director of the Conservation Programs of the NPCA.

Ms. Kathryn Hohmann, the Director of Public Lands from the Sierra Club.

And finally, Jim Bensberg, Vice Chairman, Task Force on Recreation Fees, American Recreation Coalition, accompanied by Ms. Amy Mann, the Director of Sports and Recreation, American Horse Council.

By previous request, the statements have been made part of the record, and so you can feel free to summarize. As you'll understand, we are under some scheduling conflicts today, both on the floor and other responsibilities that I happen to have.

Mr. Chandler, your statement's in the record, and let me thank you all for your patience and for rearranging your schedules today so that you could be given the bum's rush this afternoon.

I didn't mean this to happen, but it nevertheless did.

Mr. Chandler, please proceed with your statement.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM J. CHANDLER

Mr. CHANDLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

One of the troubling things about this whole issue is it seems that every time somebody wants to raise more money in the national park system, reflexive action is to reach into the user fee and admissions fee pot and basically charge the public higher fees of some kind or another.

Over the years, unfortunately, the commercial side of the fee equation, in our opinion, has been ignored. And I would recommend, sir, that it's time that maybe the two should be joined together. Because the special interests who derive income from the parks and from park-related businesses have shown an uncanny ability to escape paying their fair share of user fees, commercial user fees back to the parks.

I'm talking about the concessions industry, I'm talking about tour operators who do not pay any commercial user fee for entering the parks now.

I'm talking about utility companies that rights-of-way across national park lands and are supposed to be paying a fair market value for that right-of-way, but they are not, due to poor park service management of the program.

And there are a number of other commercial users of the parks that are simply not being charged a fair fee for being in the parks and making revenue.

I do agree, Mr. Chairman, that the National Park Service could be a lot more efficient in collecting fees under their existing authority, if they were given the ability to deduct their full cost of collection from their gross receipts.

I think that would put the program, it would give you a true economic picture of what's actually been generated from the fee program, and we would highly recommend that that be done.

The issue has arisen regarding increased collections efficiency. We've been told time and time again that the reason the Park Service does not collect all the fees that it could is because they can't deduct their costs of collection, which is another reason to let them do that, in my opinion.

There's also the issue, Mr. Chairman, of collecting fees where they don't collect fees now.

For example, at Lake Meade and Glen Canyon, the recreation areas there, we have 11.5 million visitors annually at those two areas, and the Park Service is not collecting a dime of entry fees at those two areas, although they have the authority right now to collect fees.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I did a little calculation here about how the Committee could come up with \$26 to \$113 million worth of additional revenue.

That could be derived from making commercial tour operators pay some kind of a reasonable fee for use of the parks—\$6 to \$10 million.

Running the private utility charge program for their rights-of-way at a better and more efficient level, \$2 to \$3 million.

Increasing the efficiency of the Park Service to collect the fees that they have the authority to collect now, anywhere from \$10 to \$50 million.

And you've heard varying estimates, Mr. Chairman, today about what really could be collected. You know, we're taking the number ten as the minimum and 50 as the maximum.

Then, if we eliminated some of the parks that are now exempt from charging any fees, for a variety of reasons, and there are 63 of those parks. If we reexamined those and removed from the exempt list, parks that really don't belong there, we estimate that we could get another \$8 to \$50 million in fees.

As one example, Mr. Chairman, there are no entry fees in any of the national parks in Alaska. At Glacier Bay National Park, about 175,000 visitors come in on cruise boats every year. The concessioner pays a fee, but those persons on the boat are paying no entry fee to go into the park.

In total, the four types of charges that I have just laid out, Mr. Chairman, would generate a minimum of \$26 million and a maximum perhaps of \$113 million, without any changes in existing law except to allow the Park Service the right to deduct its full cost of collection from fee receipts.

That concludes my testimony, Mr. Chairman.

[Prepared statement of Mr. Chandler follows:]



National Parks and Conservation Association



**TESTIMONY PRESENTED BY
WILLIAM J. CHANDLER
CONSERVATION DIRECTOR
NATIONAL PARKS AND CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION**

**BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, FORESTS AND PUBLIC LANDS
ON THE
CLINTON ADMINISTRATION'S
ADMISSIONS AND RECREATION FEE PROPOSAL
APRIL 29, 1993**

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, my name is Bill Chandler. I am Director of Conservation for the National Parks and Conservation Association (NPCA), a nonprofit citizens' organization dedicated to the protection and enhancement of the National Park System. On behalf of the National Parks and Conservation Association's 350,000 members, I am pleased to present our views on the Administration's public lands entry and recreation fee proposals. My remarks will be focused on fee policy in the National Park System.

Clinton Administration Proposal

The Clinton Administration has proposed legislation to increase the amount of revenue derived from public land admissions and recreation use fees. This would be accomplished by:

- ◆ Authorizing admissions fees for the first time at certain sites and areas administered by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and the Department of Agriculture.
- ◆ Increasing current admission fees at national parks.
- ◆ Raising the maximum price of the Golden Eagle Pass from \$25 to \$50.
- ◆ Establishing new recreation use fees for boaters and backcountry campers.
- ◆ Providing agencies with the incentive to collect more revenue by allowing the collecting agency to deduct a portion of their collection costs from fee receipts.

1776 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036-1904
Telephone (202) 223-NPCA(6722) • Fax (202) 659-0650



♻️ PRINTED ON RECYCLED PAPER

NPCA concurs that changes in the current fee system are in order. Although the Administration's proposal contains some worthy elements, it misses the mark for two principal reasons:

- ◆ First, the proposal does not address national park fee policy as a whole. Any discussion of fee policy should include commercial fees, as well as public user fees. Yet, commercial fees are ignored in the Interior Department proposal.
- ◆ Second, the changes recommended for admissions and recreation fees are not comprehensive in scope. If the goal is to raise additional fees from the public, a number of other defects and inequities of the current system need to be addressed.

Commercial Fees

Before the public is asked to pay more to enter and use our parks, it is fair to ask: What do commercial users of the parks pay, and do they pay their fair share?

Historically, little attention has been paid to the commercial component of the fee equation. Instead, whenever initiatives arise to raise fees, policymakers reflexively target public entry and user fees as the revenue source of choice.

Before the public is asked to pay more, NPCA recommends that Congress ensure that commercial users who profit from the parks pay reasonable use fees based on the economic benefits they derive. Some examples:

- (1) Park Concessions. National park concessioners as a class paid 2.9 percent of their total gross revenues (\$618 million) to the government in 1991. Concessions fees are too low. A competitive bidding system for concessions contracts is the best way to increase concessions fees. If concessioners as a class paid a fee equal to 10 percent of their gross receipts, approximately \$40 million in additional revenue would be generated. That's more than the first year receipts projected under the Clinton Administration's fee legislation.

Furthermore, concessions fees should be reimbursed to the National Park Service (NPS). Currently, those fees go into the general fund of the Treasury. Since park users indirectly pay the concessions fee by patronizing park concessions, it is only fair that those fees go back to NPS to help care for the parks and provide visitor services.

- (2) Commercial Operators. Hundreds of air, sea, and land tour operators use the parks for economic gain, but pay only an annual commercial license fee -- usually a flat \$50 -- to NPS. At Yosemite, an estimated 12,000 bus tours enter the park each year; these tour operators pay no license fee.

The gross revenues generated by many of these tour operators are thought to be significant. Although NPS does not maintain statistics either at individual park units or system wide, commercial bus tour operations may exceed \$150 million per year in total revenues. Cruise boat tours (operating primarily in Glacier Bay National Park,

Alaska) generate an estimated \$20 million during the time they spend in park waters. And air tours over parks may generate another \$35 million. For this commercial use of the parks, the Park Service probably receives less than \$50,000 annually in license and permit fees, or less than 0.02 percent of the estimated gross receipts of tour operators. (Actual license fee receipts are unknown due to the lack of a national data base.)

Buses, airplanes, and cruise ships impose significant stresses on park resources, such as wearing down park roads, overburdening sanitary facilities, and causing air quality degradation and excess noise. Since tour operators generate their revenues by selling the parks as a destination, fees should be structured to enable the government to collect a fair return for that commercial access.

Given the variety of tours entering parks, NPS would have to figure out a schedule of fees based on the nature of park use by various tour operators. For illustrative purposes only, NPS could raise an estimated \$6 to \$10 million annually if tour buses paid an average \$100 per entry, cruise ships \$500 per entry, and airplanes \$25.

- (3) Private Utility Companies. NPS currently has authority to charge fair market value for each private utility line (e.g., telephone, cable TV, power) that crosses a national park unit; the guiding regulation was issued in 1980. However, NPS headquarters has not provided effective direction or guidance to its park units regarding the need to collect the fee, nor has it made fee collection a priority or held its superintendents accountable for results. Some parks are rigorously establishing and charging fair market value (e.g., Fredericksburg, Colonial). Other parks, perhaps even the majority, are not.

There is no national inventory of rights-of-way use in parks, or of the number of permits issued for these uses of park land. Furthermore, there is no central accounting of the fees collected for rights-of-way permits. Fee receipts are returned to the general Treasury, not reimbursed to the NPS.

The potential for additional revenue from rights-of-way fees is illustrated by rights-of-way management at Fredericksburg National Battlefield Park. There, park staff converted outdated, flat-fee right-of-way permits (\$25 each) to right-of-way grants (at \$0.07/linear foot). As a result, total fee revenue has increased from about \$700 per year to \$5,288 per year. More recently, the park is again upping the charge to one based on appraised fair market value (\$0.20/linear foot). Once all grants are reissued at \$0.20/ linear foot, revenue will be about \$9,066.

- (4) Other Commercial Fees. NPS currently issues special use permits for miscellaneous park uses such as commercial filming and commercially sponsored special events that provide economic benefits to the user. The fee charged for the permit is set so as to enable NPS to cover its costs of issuing the permit and monitoring or supervising the activity. But NPS does not levy a commercial use fee based on economic value to the commercial user.

If these types of activities lead to economic gain for the commercial user, it seems reasonable that NPS should charge a commercial use fee based on the benefits received.

Public Admissions and Use Fees

Once policy has been changed to require all commercial users to pay their fair share, it is appropriate to ask: What reforms are needed on the public use side of the fee equation? A short list of necessary reforms would include the following:

- ◆ All fees collected by NPS should be reimbursed to NPS, and the costs of collection should be deducted by the collecting units before net revenues are re-allocated to the parks. The fee system should be managed to provide an accurate picture of both expenses and revenue. Only then will Congress be able to determine the true economic benefit of the program.
- Furthermore, allowing park units to deduct their costs of collection is necessary to ensure that the parks operate their collection programs on a full-time basis. I am consistently told that the reason park fees are not collected all of the time is because park managers periodically need to allocate their collection staff to other tasks at certain times of the year.
- ◆ Congress should ensure that fee moneys are returned to NPS as a supplement to base funding. The best way to guarantee that is to permanently appropriate net fee receipts back to NPS. Alternatively, the committee could maintain the special fee account authorized now, but direct NPS to show how fee receipts will be treated as supplementary funds in the annual budget request.
 - ◆ Fee revenue should be appropriated for fewer purposes than is now the case, and accurate accounts should be kept to show what the funds have paid for. The current park allocation formula is too complex, and the allowable uses of the fund are too many. NPCA recommends that 25 to 50 percent of net fee receipts be reallocated to the collecting parks. The remainder should be allocated on the basis of need as determined by the NPS director.

Current law requires park entry fees to be spent on resource protection, research, and interpretation; user fees are to be spent on the same activities, plus "maintenance activities related to resource protection."

I believe we could measure better the "results" derived from fee receipts if uses were concentrated on one or two programs. Visitor enjoyment of a park is determined by the quality of the park resource and the interpretation of those resources. We know there is a substantial backlog of natural resource and cultural resource projects in the parks. We know the public wants to learn about the parks. Consequently, NPCA favors concentrating no-year fee monies on cultural and natural resource rehabilitation, maintenance and protection projects, and on park interpretive programs.

- ◆ Comparable public areas should charge comparable fees regardless of the administering agency. Areas and sites that could charge fees, but do not, should be brought on line before fees at existing areas are increased. The Administration proposal moves in that direction by establishing new fees for BLM and Forest Service areas.
- ◆ Parks that are exempted from fees now should be reassessed. Fees should be charged at all parks except those specifically exempted as a class by Congress for sound reasons (e.g., "icon" parks such as Independence Hall, urban parks, etc.). There is no reason why certain parks now exempted from fees should necessarily remain so when the goal is to increase fee revenue for park purposes. Congress should review the list of 63 exempt parks to determine which truly merit continued exemption.
- ◆ NPS should be given a mandated, system-wide efficiency standard for collections, and be required to report annually on whether it met the goal on a park-by-park basis. Currently, many parks are not collecting fees at all times, and revenue is being lost. NPS has not held its managers accountable for their fee collection efforts. This is unacceptable, and should not be tolerated.

Conclusion

Many other changes could and should be made to public user fee policy. Because the list is so extensive, and because commercial fees have been ignored, NPCA believes it is time for Congress to consider passing comprehensive fee legislation to address, once and for all, the problems and issues that have been talked about for years.

Congress can continue adjusting the present system, or it can deliberately set out to design a new fee system that is simple, fairly balanced between commercial and public users, and that produces the amount of revenue needed by the parks today.

Mr. VENTO. Thank you, Mr. Chandler, for summarizing. I think that that is very helpful.

Obviously, there's been some discussion about some of these areas. I'll have a question or two in a moment.

Ms. Hohmann. Am I pronouncing your name correctly?

Ms. HOHMANN. Yes, you are.

Mr. VENTO. Please proceed with your testimony, and thank you for your being here.

STATEMENT OF KATHRYN HOHMANN

Ms. HOHMANN. Thank you for allowing me to come here to testify on this important public lands issue.

Sierra Club obviously has many members who get out in the public lands often, and discover that again, as we noted earlier, that fees are not always collected at collection points when we do indeed have that authority right now.

Sierra Club's basic philosophy on the collection of user fees is that if the area has been improved, we have no problem paying those fees.

We are, however, especially troubled that fees would be instituted for undeveloped back country areas, where there are no facilities to be found. We question why the public is made to pay a fee to visit their own lands, to walk around and have picnics.

We understand the necessity for reducing deficits and maintaining solvency. However, we don't think that this proposal has really taken a credible approach.

We find it disturbing that while we are being asked to pay and shoulder more of the burden, extractive industries are getting off the hook.

We find it a little troubling that a mere three weeks after the Administration has deleted from its budget resolution, key public lands extractive industry revenue raising measures, that we'd be asked to shoulder an additional burden.

We think the Administration needs to return to its original goals, such as reform of the 1872 Mining Law. We find it ironic that we have 12,000 acres of streams in this country that are permanently degraded by mining operations, and yet we're being asked to pay a larger fee to visit some of those same areas, in fact, to swim in them.

We're at the point where we might ironically advise our members to bring their mining claim stakes and not their tent stakes when they visit the public lands.

We wonder if it will cost more to have a picnic than to raise a beef cow on those lands.

We'd ask that the Administration review its original proposals. We originally went to Congress with a button that said, "earth to Congress, pass the Clinton proposal."

Now what we're saying is, "Clinton, pass the Clinton proposal, return to your original sound revenue generating ideas."

Thank you.

[Prepared statement of Ms. Hohmann follows:]

SIERRA
CLUB



408 C Street, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20002 202·547·1141

Testimony of Kathryn Hohmann
Washington Director
Public Lands Program

April 29, 1993

Before the
Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands
Committee on Natural Resources

"When we try to pick out anything by itself, we find it hitched to everything else in the universe." *John Muir*
National Headquarters: 730 Polk Street, San Francisco, California 94109 (415) 776-2211

PRINTED ON RECYCLED PAPER

Mister Chairman and members of the Subcommittee:

My name is Kathryn Hohmann and I speak today on behalf of the half-million members of the Sierra Club. I am offering testimony regarding legislation to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965. This bill would increase fees for recreation on America's public lands.

This legislation is of great concern to our 600,000 members, many of whom regularly use our public lands for recreation. We wish to maintain the ecological integrity of these lands while ensuring that entrance to these natural wonders remains possible for all who wish to enjoy them. In light of these goals, we cannot support this legislation in its present form. I would like to first outline why we do not support this strategy. Then I would like to offer a few comments about how this proposal has been received in light of changes the Administration has made in its own budget proposal.

Let me outline our basic philosophy with regard to user fees. While we support fees for the use of developed facilities such as improved campgrounds, we do not support the imposition of entrance fees on an array of lands, including those under the United States Forest Service and the United States Department of Interior jurisdiction. Therefore, Section 1(a) is not satisfactory to our members.

Section 1(b) would increase the maximum amount charged for an unlimited annual permit from not more than \$25 to not more than \$35, and also doubles the annual permit fee for single parks. In addition, the bill would increase the maximum paid for a single visit at designated units from not more than \$5 per vehicle to not more than \$16 per vehicle. We believe these increases, particularly the latter provision on single visits, will have an impact on the number of people who are able to enjoy an outdoor experience. In today's highly urban, stressful world, the importance of these experiences cannot be overestimated. Sadly, the Administration's bill would make the most difference to those in our urban areas, those already disadvantaged by poor environmental quality.

In addition, the new fee system extends to use of undeveloped lands. We consider entrance fees significant barriers limiting the public's access to their own lands, but when improvements have not been made, and the user is seeking a back country experience, an increased fee becomes even less acceptable to our members. Therefore, the Sierra Club objects most strenuously to the section.

Furthermore, we question the assumption that the implementation of public entrance fees will result in increased revenues for management of federal lands. In the past, such efforts were rewarded with decreased funding through regular appropriations channels which more than offset the additional funds garnered from entrance fee collection.

We understand the necessity of reducing deficits and maintaining solvency, however, we do not believe that this legislation offers a credible solution. Instead, we would urge the Congress and this Administration to again consider the revenue potentials from reform of subsidies currently enjoyed by extractive industries on the federal domain.

We find it more than a little disturbing that a mere three weeks after the Administration deleted from its own budget resolution the very items that would have raised revenues from use of the federal domain, we now must comment on legislation that would raise two-fold the cost to the public of visiting their own lands.

General reform of outdated laws, such as the 1872 Mining Law and whole-scale revision of current livestock grazing schemes, would generate hefty sums while also preventing further environmental degradation. Yet the Administration has backed away from these much needed reforms, letting us debate instead today the imposition of fees for swimming and picnicking. Though there have been encouraging press conferences on these western subsidy issues, the reality remains: the extractive industries still enjoy a Gravy Train on the federal domain while users such as recreationists are now asked to shoulder additional burdens.

Today, there are more than 12,000 miles of degraded streams and rivers on the public lands, permanently impaired by mining operations that pay no royalty to the federal treasury for the minerals they extract -- and some \$4 billion are extracted each year. Yet today we are debating a fee for swimming.

Today we charge a mere \$2.50 to patent a mining claim on the federal domain, yet are contemplating a fee for an overnight stay on the federal lands that exceeds this. Will it be more expensive to camp than to use the 1872 Mining Law to gain fee title to lands outright? Are we being told to bring our mining claim stakes, not our tent stakes?

Today the Administration has sent us a proposal that could make it more expensive to have a picnic than to graze beef cattle on the public lands.

Thank you for your consideration and time.

Mr. VENTO. Thank you, Ms. Hohmann.

And finally we have, I guess, Jim Bensberg, the Vice Chairman of the Task Force on Recreation Fees.

Why don't you proceed, and I think we can get your testimony included, and then move along to a question or two after I come back from voting.

STATEMENT OF JIM BENSBURG

Mr. BENSBURG. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am representing the American Recreation Coalition today.

And as the Committee has heard, and fully recognizes, fees for public recreation facilities are not new. The Forest Service collects approximately \$45 million annually in camping fees and ski area permit fees, as does the National Park Service.

Much of the philosophical and legal basis for recreation fees is outlined in the 1964 Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. That Act was the product of those who recognized the importance of recreation, and it has enriched our lives immeasurably.

Yet, a great deal has changed since the time of this Act, and despite periodic amendments under the guidance of this Committee, criterion-specific provisions for fees deserve careful review and a clear and comprehensive strategy.

The framework for a new recreation fee strategy was outlined in part by the report of the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors. It argued that public recreation program spending needed to rise, and that primary responsibility for the increases should fall upon those who are the direct beneficiaries.

The report noted that recreation expenditures exceed \$300 billion annually and are steadily rising, but the report also argued for accountability between fees and services provided.

While our present budgetary situation does not allow us to provide a free lunch, so to speak, we cannot and should not forget that after charging for lunch, we have an obligation to serve the feast.

We've looked at the proposals contained in the fiscal year 1994 budget proposal to initiate and increase a variety of fees. And after reviewing the information made available to date, the American Recreation Coalition has concluded that while the concept of recreation fees is acceptable in many instances, inadequate details have been provided to assure us that the current proposal meets several essential principles.

First, that the fees are equitable, and aimed at recovering costs where the services provided or the facilities used would otherwise represent cost to the taxpayer.

Second, that the fee system is efficient, costing the least amount practical to administer.

Third, that the fees are convenient for the recreationist so the voluntary compliance is readily achievable.

And fourth, that the fee system is coherent and integrated, so that the charges are minimized.

Finally, that fee revenues are returned to benefit resources, facilities and programs utilized by those paying the fees.

The recreation community also believes that new and higher fees should have a demonstrable positive impact on resource protection and visitor services.

While it is true that recreationists today do not pay fees equivalent to the entire cost of the Federal Government for managing recreation, fee increases which are designed solely to replace general fund appropriations will be unpopular and difficult to implement.

Moreover, recreation activities are a non-consumptive use of outdoor American federal lands, and this is in contrast to other public land uses.

The recreation and related tourism are clearly positive forces in bolstering the economies of small communities which have often been strained by these tough economic times.

The ARC urges this Committee to modify the proposal of the Clinton Administration in such ways as to ensure compatibility with these outlying principles.

To do so, consideration should be given to the adoption of a new Recreation Fees and Public Lands Enhancement Act which replaces the authorities now found under the Land and Water Conservation Act.

Further, we urge that Federal recreation fees charged to the individual visitors be considered in light of fees now charged or proposed to be charged to recreation service providers operating through Federal concessions and permits, and by state and local agencies where such monies are helping to offset Federal operating costs.

To give you an example, the Committee should consider the winter parking permits paid by snowmobilers and skiers. Also the California system of green stickers, which permit off-highway vehicle recreation in California to be paid for by those users.

Let me just summarize here very quickly, Mr. Chairman. I know we're short on time.

Congress and the Administration need to review, if warranted, address a potential increase in liability arising from the collection of recreation fees.

Private landowners endure much higher standards of care and liability risk once they receive any compensation for use of their lands.

And there's a decision recently in Pennsylvania which cost that state dearly for damages to a drowning victim. We'd like to see that potential eliminated at the Federal level as well.

In conclusion, the American Recreation Coalition offers its full support to this body in its efforts to develop a recreation fee strategy that plays a role in the protection and enhancement of America's outdoors legacy.

We encourage the Committee to ensure that any strategy also provides administrative flexibility and quality services to the tens of thousands of visitors who visit our public lands each year.

To aid in your efforts, we are attaching a discussion paper which is part of our testimony.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

[Discussion paper follows:]

RECREATION FEES INITIATIVE

Concept:

Develop amendments to provisions now applying to the collection of recreation fees on federal lands which meet the following objectives:

- ◆ they meet the revenue targets set forth by President Clinton in his FY94 budget proposal (approximately \$260 million over 4 years);
- ◆ they satisfy the recreation community's call for any fee legislation to be (1) equitable, (2) efficient and (3) convenient; and
- ◆ they yield a clear benefit for the natural resources managed by the federal land agencies ("if there is pain, there should be gain").

The amendments could be introduced as a package entitled The Federal Recreation and Outdoor Legacy Enhancement Act of 1993.

Elements:

Authorizes limited expansion of the sites at which entrance fees may be collected, including national monuments, national volcanic monuments, national scenic areas, and areas of concentrated use administered by USDA, and adds BLM as one of the agencies authorized to collect entrance fees at appropriate locations.

Allows increases of entrance fees from current levels (\$5 generally, except selected areas which may charge \$10) over a ten year period, with ceilings on the ultimate rate and maximum year-to-year increases specified.

Authorizes collecting agencies to withhold the cost of fee collection, either as a flat percentage of collection or based upon actual costs. Withheld funds would be available immediately without further appropriation action.

Amends the Golden Eagle Passport in the following ways: allowable charge would be authorized to increase to a maximum of \$50 by 2003; the current wallet card would be replaced with a 40-page booklet containing both a wallet card and a vehicle decal and providing information on sources of detailed opportunity information, with addresses and phone numbers, explanations of the recreational opportunities normally available on lands managed by each of the agencies and explanations of major federal area systems (wild and scenic rivers, Wilderness, scenic byways, etc.); permits private sector sales of the passport through consignment and allows a 10% commission to cover costs; revises the passport to cover 12 months from the date of purchase versus the calendar year (current provision).

PAGE TWO, RECREATION FEES INITIATIVE

Creates annual geographic region passes costing not more than \$20, with all revenues earmarked for the federal lands in that region.

Revises the restrictions on recreation fee collections on federal lands, including campgrounds and boat launch sites, unless extensive services are provided. New restriction would be that fees could only be charged for sites where federal operational costs per capita exceed overall agency recreation costs per capita by at least 100%.

Creates a "hardened account" (or trust fund) into which private sales of the revised Golden Eagle Passport would be deposited. Funds from the account would not be subject to appropriation but would be available immediately the fiscal year following collection for (1) Challenge Cost-Share Projects on federal lands to aid recreation and/or wildlife or (2) funding for conservation corps projects on federal lands.

Places all new recreation fees, other than those arising from the private sale of Golden Eagle Passports, into a special account subject to appropriation and available solely for federal lands resource protection and visitor services programs. Funds from the account would be subject to appropriation, but would not be available for appropriation if the general funding for the recreation, wildlife and resource conservation programs of the federal land managing agencies did not exceed those for base year FY93, CPI adjusted.

Eliminates unusual federal fee collection restrictions, including COE.

Per Administration request: Raise the minimum age for eligibility for the free Golden Age Passport to 65 (from 62) -- phased in so that no existing holders lose their eligibility.

Allows each federal agency to designate up to 10% of its fee collection sites as "fee policy experiment locations," each with the ability to recruit an advisory panel of government and private sector officials to help develop, implement and review fee strategies. Among those issues which might be considered are: differential pricing designed to encourage visitation during non-peak periods; fee discounts for those arriving via public conveyances to reduce parking demand or for those who contribute their time while visiting; automated fee collections (like Metro); fee waivers for certain individuals whose ability to pay is limited; and reduced fees for those who use their visits to learn by attending interpretive programs.

Scoring:

The fiscal implications for the above proposal can be estimated in part from the FY94 budget proposal and in part from the OMB estimates offered as testimony in July 1992 on the proposed America the Beautiful Passport Act.

4/29/93

Mr. VENTO. This discussion paper which you've attached, does this describe your proposal or the Administration's proposal?

Mr. BENSBURG. As I understand it, Mr. Chairman, it describes our response to the Administration's proposal.

Mr. VENTO. Ms. Mann, Amy, do you have a statement today?

Ms. MANN. No, I don't.

Mr. VENTO. You're just here to respond to questions.

Well, we appreciate your presence, along with your colleague, Mr. Bensberg.

I note the statement was prepared for Robert Rasor, and he obviously could not make it this afternoon. So you're filling in, is that correct?

Mr. BENSBURG. That's correct, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for your indulgence. He had to be sent away to Columbus for a pending matter there.

Mr. VENTO. Well, we have a final vote here. Probably I'll come back again and ask some additional questions of you.

Let's see how far we get.

First of all, there is the proposal to change the criteria for the campgrounds, LWCF, from eight to compliance with the majority of those criteria.

This would somewhat liberalize the opportunity to charge, although I think many of the campgrounds probably have and do meet all eight criteria. There are apparently some that do not.

Any reaction to this particular proposal?

Mr. Chandler, Ms. Hohmann, Mr. Bensberg.

Do you understand the change in criteria? There are eight criteria that they need to meet. So if you don't, well, you might want to look at that. It's a technical glitch that was put in when the Land and Water Conservation Fund was written, to try to have the standard of service at that site.

As you say, you pay for the dinner, you ought to have something there.

And the question is, are these realistic, and what would the implementation, what would the effect of it be in terms of those services provided.

On the user side, paying on the user fee side or entrance fee side, permitting the deductibility of expenses paid, as in the case of Fish and Wildlife, they said they can deduct 30 percent to pay for that. They said that still didn't provide an adequate return or an adequate coverage of what their expenses were.

And the question is do you think that that gets at what the impact of that will be in terms of parks where entrance fees are charged, Mr. Chandler?

Mr. CHANDLER. We disagree, Congressman Vento, with the Administration's approach where they only want to deduct the additional costs of collecting fees under their proposal.

We think that all costs of fee collection ought to be deducted from the gross, because we are told, time and time again, that people don't collect fees because they don't feel like they have anything to gain from collecting the fees.

You know, if they can't pay for the staff to be on the gates, and they've got a fire or a heavy visitation situation somewhere, they pull the people off the gates.

We think that an honest fee system would have, you know, you would have the gross, minus the expenses, to give you the net.

And until Congress understands what the net is, Congressman, it's really hard to know not only what the existing program is producing, but what increased fees would actually deliver.

And so we don't support the Administration's proposal to partially deduct the fees. We would like to see them all deducted, to get this system on an honest accounting procedure.

Mr. VENTO. That could have the effect of actually driving fee costs to a higher level. Do you understand why, Mr. Chandler?

Mr. CHANDLER. Over the long term, it might. On the other hand, Mr. Congressman, I think there are a number of ways where they can improve efficiencies under the current system without even raising the current fees now for either admissions or user fees.

Mr. VENTO. Ms. Hohmann, you suggested where there's no improvement, there ought not to be a fee charged. Obviously, wilderness, almost by definition, has little modification to it, so therefore all wilderness type of permits and that would not be subject to it.

Ms. HOHMANN. That's right.

In fact, again, we see a real cross-cutting kind of motion here with this Administration, that they have been loathe to really attack issues where they could raise hefty sums of revenue, and yet seem content to take this out of the hide of the general public.

And so, yes, we do oppose that.

Mr. VENTO. We'll all stand in recess until I complete my voting. I hope I make it this time.

[Recess.]

Mr. VENTO. I was about to, I was asking, when we broke off, Ms. Hohmann, I was referring to the unimproved sort of sites.

She's out of the room right now, okay.

Mr. Bensberg, you commented on quite a number of issues here, and you spoke specifically about accountability for the use of the lunch.

Do you agree that the funds that are in fact collected on this basis ought to be used to supplement the funding of the agencies that collect such fees?

That they be in addition to what their base line funding is. Is that correct?

Mr. BENSBERG. I believe that's the position of the ARC, Mr. Chairman. I will confess that I'm not as conversant on this as—

Mr. VENTO. Well, the revenues are returned to benefit the resource facilities programs utilized by those paying such fees.

So that's I assume what—do you feel, what is your attitude with regards to this fee program that existed last year, under America the Beautiful, that they had a common passport that would be utilized for all of the different agencies?

Mr. BENSBERG. We supported that program.

Mr. VENTO. You supported that. That's what I thought.

Obviously, that isn't included here in the provisions that we have before us.

I note, Mr. Chandler, that you think that the accounting problems that would exist with regards to deduction of the costs of collecting for old and new is unrealistic.

Is that what you're telling us?

Mr. CHANDLER. I don't understand the question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VENTO. The deduction of costs of collection should be of course across the board?

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. VENTO. You think the accounting problems are unrealistic that exist with regards to this present strategy?

Mr. CHANDLER. Well, yes. I think it's going to be very difficult to separate additional monies, you know, additional costs from current costs.

I mean, you know, you've got base costs for collection. How do you determine what the additional cost is?

I think that's sort of a fiction, and what they're really saying is they want to deduct a certain percentage of their costs, and I believe that's \$5 million out of the total \$14 million or so that they would be spending on the program.

Mr. VENTO. I mean, I don't know how it would work, where you'd have an increase in the fee in a unit of the park system, if you somehow were able to deduct the increased amount from the—or the amount of the costs from the increased amount but not the amount that previously had been collected, as an example.

Mr. CHANDLER. I agree with you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VENTO. I mean, I expect the reason this came about is because of one of the bean counters at OMB or some place decided that they didn't want to lose that any further, but I think the net effect is going to be the same, no matter what.

Mr. CHANDLER. Well, if they really had any confidence in their projections, Mr. Chairman, in terms of what they could get from increased efficiency in collection, one would think that they would have some idea that they would take in a lot more money and still come out ahead, so to speak, by spending a little bit more money to fully collect the fees.

Mr. VENTO. Well, I think that probably is the probable cause in any case.

You specifically pointed out Glen Canyon and Glacier Bay. Glacier Bay, of course, under the Alaska provision for no fee collection.

I suspect that most parks in Alaska would be excluded anyway because of the low visitation and the remoteness of such sites. There may be some at Denali or other places where revenue could be generated.

There's certainly destination parks for most that use them.

In any event, the fee collection at Glacier Bay tour ship, that fee that could actually itself be increased to reflect any type of increased visitation or costs associated with such tour ships.

Is that correct?

Mr. CHANDLER. Absolutely.

Mr. VENTO. Of course, there are any number of locations where we have tour ships that visit national parks.

I'm reminded of those sites in the Virgin Islands, as well.

Do you generally think that the fees associated with such tour ships, and I know that you also included bus tour vehicles, are generally not adequate considering the benefit that is attributed to the tour ship line ownership or to the visitors that are using that resource in that manner?

Mr. CHANDLER. That's correct, Mr. Chairman.

These people in effect pay no fee now. They pay a license fee maybe, \$50 to \$100, depending upon what region of the Park Service they're in, but they pay no economic user fee for the economic revenues that they're generating using the parks as a tour destination.

Mr. VENTO. Well, I think sometimes I have the impression in some sites that I've visited that the Park Service ends up being basically the lavatory attendants too often for the tour ships and other types of intensive use patterns in parks, which is really disappointing.

Ms. Hohmann, when we departed for the last vote, I was attempting to solicit a response based on the idea that an unimproved site should not have a fee, was your suggestion.

Is there any fee that you could accept? For instance, in many instances in wilderness areas, we now have established permit systems to regulate the use and to reduce the impact, campsite permits and so forth.

Are those, are there any fees associated with those today, Ms. Hohmann?

As far as I know, there is not.

Ms. HOHMANN. There is not, no. No. And our members would prefer that there not be a fee when there hadn't been improvements made on the public lands.

The Administration has suggested that lands, back country lands, such as BLM back country, have a fee attached to them, and our members do——

Mr. VENTO. Yes. I understand that they do not favor that. But I mean, in the sense of issuing the permit and the administrative costs of it, wouldn't that, in terms of maintaining that software program and whatever else they do, wouldn't that be a justifiable basis for having some sort of fee associated? The costs of mailing?

Ms. HOHMANN. Our public lands people, volunteers have talked about bearing the burden of those kinds of costs.

Mr. VENTO. Well, I think it's something to keep in mind. I don't think there's any suggestion being made by others to do that in this instance, but I think it is something to bear in mind, to look at.

Obviously the improvement issue is one factor. In many instances there are trails, sort of a mixed result in terms of what goes on.

I think that as we look more at wilderness management, we find that it is not necessarily because the resource appears not to be modified, even trying to keep it in that manner is sometimes difficult for the Park Service.

In other words, going to extraordinary lengths not to use motorized use in those areas, is an example, but it does necessitate additional costs to maintain that.

Ms. HOHMANN. Right. We have sought additional funding for trails maintenance and building in the past, through the authorizing, or rather, the appropriations channel.

We haven't met with the kind of success we would have liked.

Mr. VENTO. And even where you do meet with it, the money doesn't always get spent where it's supposed to be spent, let me remind you.

Ms. HOHMANN. That's right.

Mr. VENTO. As a result of some work that we did.

I do think though that some reflective and deliberate consideration of that ought to be a part of the package.

Actually, what the Administration's proposed this year turns out to be rather modest. After CBO did its work, we found that while they were projecting \$60 million, actually the result of what they propose as changes would be about \$41 million, so that's really what we have to come up with in terms of the overall recommendation to the Budget Committee.

I have really no further questions, unless you have further comments yourself, that you wanted to add.

I'm urgently needed in the Banking Committee to spend some billions of dollars more for the S&Ls.

I would much rather stay here with you all, but they need my presence.

And so with that said, and with no further comments, I hope that we would have Mr. Moffitt up. We're especially interested in some of these fair market value questions.

Let me just ask Mr. Moffitt to return to the table and excuse the remaining witnesses.

Mr. MOFFITT. Mr. Chairman, could I ask for the insertion into the record of four revenue-generation proposals that would derive that \$26 to \$100 million I said could be derived.

Mr. VENTO. Yes. We don't want to keep that a secret. We want that in the record.

[The information follows:]

REVENUE GENERATION PROPOSAL

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Source: Commercial Use Fee

Payor: Commercial Tour Operators

Existing/New: New

Proposal: Replace existing flat-fee commercial use licenses for commercial tour operators with a commercial tour vehicle entrance fee which more closely reflects the true value of the national parks as a destination for commercial tours. Direct the National Park Service (NPS) to establish a reasonable charge for tour operators, based on their economic use of the park.

Estimated Additional Revenue: \$6 to \$10 million system-wide.

Comments: Under the current system, individual park units decide how to manage and track the number of commercial tours operating in the park. Many parks impose no commercial use license fee on these users, despite very heavy bus visitation; some parks charge \$50 per year for a license or permit; some parks charge \$100 per year. Annual permit fees (where applied) are imposed on a flat-fee basis, and do not reflect the licensee's frequency of park usage, the physical size of the vehicle, or the number of tour passengers aboard.

The gross revenues generated by many of these tour operators may be significant. Although the National Park Service (NPS) does not maintain statistics either at individual park units or system wide, commercial bus tour operations may exceed \$150 million per year in total revenues. Cruise boat tours (operating primarily in Glacier Bay) generate more than \$20 million during the time they spend in park waters, and air tours may generate another \$35 million. Of this, the Park Service in all likelihood receives less than \$50,000 annually in license and permit fees, less than 0.003 percent of the estimated gross receipts of tour operators.

Buses, airplanes and cruise ships impose significant impacts on park resources, including erosion of park roads, overburdening of sanitary facilities, erosion of visible air quality, and excess noise. Since tour operators generate their revenues by selling the parks as a destination, fees should be structured to enable the government to collect a fair return for that commercial access.

Given the variety of tours entering parks, NPS will have to figure out a schedule of fees based on the nature of park use by various tour operators. For illustrative purposes only, NPS could raise \$6 to \$10 million annually if tour buses paid an average \$100 per entry, cruise ships \$500 per entry, and airplanes \$25.

FEE GENERATION PROPOSAL

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Source: Commercial Use Fee

Payor: Private Utility Companies

Existing/New: Existing

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 5, 79; 23 U.S.C. 317; 36 CFR Part 14

- Proposal:
- (a) Direct NPS to establish a national data base on all utility rights-of-way in each park by the end of FY 1994, the fee charged for their use, and the expiration date of the right-of-way permit(s).
 - (b) Direct NPS to charge fair market value for all rights-of-way permits issued or renewed in FY 1994 and thereafter.
 - (c) Revise existing law to require that fee revenue be reimbursed to the NPS (instead of the Federal Treasury).

Estimated Additional Revenue: \$2 to \$3 million

Comments: NPS currently has authority to charge fair market value for each private utility line (e.g., telephone, cable TV, power) that crosses a national park unit; the guiding regulation was issued in 1980. However, NPS headquarters has not provided effective direction or guidance to its park units regarding the need to collect the fee, nor has it made fee collection a priority and held its superintendents accountable for collecting it. Some parks are rigorously establishing and charging fair market value (e.g., Fredericksburg, Colonial). Other parks (perhaps even the majority) are not.

There is no national inventory of park rights-of-way use in parks, or the number of permits issued for these uses of park land. Furthermore, there is no central accounting of the fees collected for rights-of-way permits. Fee receipts are returned to the Treasury, not reimbursed to the NPS.

Potential for additional revenue is illustrated by right-of-way management at Fredericksburg National Battlefield Park. There, park staff converted dated, flat-fee right-of-way permits (\$25 each) to more current right-of-way grants (at \$0.07/linear foot), and the park is again upping the charge to one based on appraised fair market value (\$0.20/linear foot). As a result, total fee revenue has increased from about \$700 per year to \$5,288 per year. Once all grants are reissued at \$0.20/ linear foot, revenue will be about \$9,066.

REVENUE GENERATION PROPOSAL

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Source: Entry and Recreation Use Fees

Payer: Park Users

Existing/New: Existing

Proposal: Improve National Park Service collection efficiency for existing entry and recreation use fees by authorizing parks to subtract the cost of collection from the gross fee receipts to provide an incentive for enhanced collections.

Estimated Additional Revenue: \$10 to \$50 million

Comments: Because of operations budget shortages, many entrance fee-collecting parks leave entrance stations unmanned for significant periods during days when visitation may be heavy. The severity of this problem varies with each park. Some parks collect fees as little as 25 percent of available time, others about 80 percent of the time. However, if fee collection activities were operating at 75 percent efficiency (collecting fees 75 percent of the available time) across the system, entrance and user fees would generate an additional \$30 million per year, say NPS rangers.

Both the National Park Service Budget Office and the Interior Department Inspector General have explored this fee shortfall and have arrived at significantly different estimates of the amount of revenue available from increased collection efficiency. The estimate above reflects the range of this uncertainty.

At a minimum, an additional \$10 million could be generated within the existing structure of the fee collection system, and without raising entry or use fees, if the fee-collecting parks were able to provide for more collection staff, and fund their collection costs from gross fee receipts.

REVENUE GENERATION PROPOSAL
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Source: Park Entrance Fee

Payor: General Public

Existing/New: Existing

Proposal: Reduce the number of parks prohibited from charging entry fees by transferring authority to designate fees at all parks to the Secretary of the Interior. Congress would retain the power to review and assent to secretarial recommendations.

Estimated Additional Revenue: \$8 to \$50 million

Comments: Currently, 63 national park areas are exempt from entrance fees under the provisions of the LWCF amendments, many of them due to the political interests extant at the time the areas were included in the National Park System. This approach may need revision in light of current budget concerns. While retaining the powers of review and assent with Congress, transferring the authority for designating which parks should have entry fees to the Secretary of the Interior would allow more thorough consideration of both the needs and the abilities of parks to provide entrance fee revenue.

The potential amount of additional revenues generated will depend on the number of previously designated no-fee areas the Secretary (with Congressional approval) designates to charge fees. Clearly, some "icon" parks such as Statue of Liberty and Independence Hall, should not charge fees. However, there is no good reason for exempting certain other parks from entry fees. At a minimum, if only Canaveral National Seashore, Virgin Islands National Park, Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Mount Rushmore National Memorial, and Denali National Park and Preserve were to impose nominal fees, all thoroughly discussed in recent years, the Park Service would realize an additional \$8 million, according to the Inspector General.

Mr. MOFFITT. Could I also ask to insert in the record, Mr. Chairman, a list of the 63 exempt parks right now, which we recommend be reviewed to see if they really merit exemption.

Mr. VENTO. I think that would really be helpful. Is that a document from the National Park Service?

Mr. MOFFITT. Yes, it is, sir. It's taken out of NPS-22.

Mr. VENTO. Okay. As long as you have the proper citations for it, without objection, we'll permit that to be added to the record.
[The information follows:]

RECREATION FEE
NPS-22
RECREATION FEES

GUIDELINE
Chapter 3
Page 11

- 2) This fee applies to a family wishing to pay the single visit entrance fee.

NOTE: A family traveling together on multiple vehicles or horses may use one Golden Eagle Pass or Annual Park Pass or Golden Age Passport or Golden Access Passport, as applicable, to gain entry.

- 3) A family must be traveling together to qualify for the family entrance fee. A "family" is defined as including a person's spouse, children and parents. This definition is taken from Senate Report No. 93-745, dated March 22, 1974 that became part of the administrative history for P.L. 93-303 (see Chapter 2).
- 4) At those parks with a vehicle fee, a family shall pay NO MORE THAN the vehicle fee at the park, e.g. \$3, \$5 or \$10.
- 5) At those parks with ONLY a per person fee, a family shall pay NO MORE THAN the equivalent vehicle fee, e.g. \$3 or \$5.

3. Department of the Interior Lifetime Pass

This pass is not authorized by the LWCFA and has been discontinued. However, any retiree now holding a lifetime pass is allowed free entry when displaying the pass. This pass does not provide a discount on Daily Recreation Use or Special Recreation Permit fees. Individuals bearing this pass may be eligible to receive a Golden Age Passport.

4. Non-fee permits

- a. The LWCFA mandates that a recreation fee shall not be charged for a non-recreation visit.
- b. Non-fee permits may be established by the park Superintendent for issuance ONLY to persons entering the park for a non-recreational purpose, e.g., concession personnel, NPS employees assigned to the park, persons conducting regular business for State, local or Federal government agencies, persons engaged in First Amendment activity, or native Americans engaged in religious and related activities.

RECREATION FEE
NPS-22
RECREATION FEES

GUIDELINE
 Chapter 3
 Page 12

- c. The park Superintendent is responsible for the design (decal or window card suggested), production and cost.
- d. Accountability control and justification shall be provided for each permit.

5. Statutory Prohibitions

- a. Sixty-three national park areas are exempted from entrance fees.
- b. Areas 1 through 18 are exempted by Public Law 100-203, December 22, 1987:
 - 1. Alaska - 14 Parks (Denali not included)
 - 2. District of Columbia - 15 Parks
 - 3. Canaveral NS
 - 4. USS Arizona Memorial
 - 5. Independence NHP
 - 6. San Juan NHS
 - 7. Arlington House, The Robert E. Lee Memorial
 - 8. Fort Sumter NM *
 - 9. Isle Royale NP *
 - 10. Cumberland Island NS *
 - 11. Chattahoochee River NRA **
 - 12. Chickasaw NRA **
 - 13. Cuyahoga Valley NRA **
 - 14. Gateway NRA **
 - 15. Golden Gate NRA (also P.L 95-625)
 - 16. Greenbelt Park **
 - 17. Indiana Dunes **
 - 18. Santa Monica Mountains **

Parks 19 through 24 are exempted by 16 USC 4601-6a(a)(3):

- 19. Great Smoky Mountains NP
- 20. Blue Ridge Parkway
- 21. Natchez Trace Parkway
- 22. John D. Rockefeller, Jr. Memorial Parkway
- 23. George Washington Memorial Parkway
- 24. Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania NMP

RECREATION FEE
NPS-22
RECREATION FEES

GUIDELINE
 Chapter 3
 Page 13

INCLUDES: Baltimore-Washington Parkway; a unit of Catoctin Mountain Park and Colonial Parkway at Colonial NHP

25. Point Reyes NS (P.L. 96-199)
26. James A. Garfield NHS (P.L. 96-607)
27. Statue of Liberty NM (P.L. 100-55, 6-19-87)
28. Mount Rushmore NM (Sec. 3, Act of 6-15-38; 52 Stat 694)
29. Channel Islands NP (P.L. 96-199)
30. Martin Luther King NHS (P.L. 96-428)
31. Abraham Lincoln Birthplace NHS (16 USC 211)
32. Virgin Islands NP (96-348)
33. War In The Pacific NHP (P.L. 95-348)
34. Fort Jefferson NM (P.L. 96-287)
35. Biscayne NP (96-287)
36. Lincoln Home NHS (Solicitor Opinion based on deed reservation)

* - Concessioner provides primary public access to park; combined concession fee and authorized park entrance fee would EXCEED maximum amount of the authorized entrance fee (P.L. 100-203).

** - Park provides significant outdoor recreation opportunities in an urban environment and to which access is publicly available at multiple locations (P.L. 100-203).

DAILY RECREATION USE FEE

1. These fees, when established, are paid in addition to entrance fees. The most common use fees are for camping (individual / group), guided tours and parking.

NOTE - Foreign visitors shall pay the applicable use fee unless they meet criteria established for granting an educational fee waiver - refer to Fee Waiver section in this chapter.

Foreign visitors are NOT eligible for a Golden Age or Golden Access Passport and the 50 per cent use fee discount, unless domiciled in this country - refer to Golden Age and Golden Access sections in this chapter.

2. The LWCFA identified the following 18 specific facilities or services that are eligible for recreation use fees:

RECREATION FEE
NPS-22
RECREATION FEES

GUIDELINE
 Chapter 3
 Page 14

- a. Tent, trailer and recreation vehicle sites
- b. Specialized boat launching facilities and services
- c. Lockers
- d. Boat storage and handling facilities
- e. Elevators
- f. Ferries and other means of transportation
- g. Bathhouses
- h. Swimming pools
- i. Overnight shelters
- j. Guided tours
- k. Electrical hook-ups
- l. Vehicle and trailer storage facilities
- m. Rental of non-motorized boats
- n. Rental of motorized boats
- o. Rental of hunting blinds
- p. Reservation services
- q. Specialized sites (highly developed)
- r. Group camping sites

3. The LWCFA provides that a use fee shall be charged if at least ONE of the following criteria exist:

- a. A substantial Federal investment has been made in the facility.
- b. The facility requires regular maintenance.
- c. The facility is characterized by the presence of agency personnel.
- d. The facility is utilized for the personal benefit of the user for a fixed period of time.

AND

ALL of the following criteria are satisfied:

- e. The facility is developed, administered or provided by any bureau of the Department.
- f. The facility is provided at Federal expense.
- g. The nature of the facility is such that fee collection is administratively and economically practical.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Moffitt, what about the issue, and I had meant to ask this question, and I appreciate your return to the witness table.

With regards to the fair market question governing the rights-of-way across parks, could you give us any response as to the present, the current status of those types of fees?

Mr. MOFFITT. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

We recognize that our rights-of-way program is deficient, has been. Over the past several years, we have been taking steps to improve. We will be submitting new regulations, within the next couple of months, covering rights-of-way.

In many instances, in the Park System, the charges are the minimum for rights-of-way, \$25 to—we do have extremes, up to \$4,000—but we are implementing the fair market value costs for rights-of-way. It varies from park to park, of how we've been able to.

Mr. VENTO. Is that reflected in the current budget submission, change in revenue that might be associated with such a fair market implementation?

Mr. MOFFITT. No, sir.

Mr. VENTO. Well, I think we may be looking very strongly at that.

What about the issue limitations in terms of the tour boats and the tour bus operations which pay either a minimal or no fee?

Mr. MOFFITT. Well, there's two aspects to this question, Mr. Chairman.

In some instances, the tour operators, the people on the tour buses are paying an entrance fee. In the park which I was last superintendent of, the Rangers would get on the bus and count the number of people and collect the entrance fee.

In other areas, this is not the case.

Congressman Synar has raised a question about commercial use licenses that we issue in the parks. We are working on this.

As we speak, there's a task force meeting developing criteria and guidelines for our park managers so that we can improve in that area.

Mr. VENTO. Do you need additional authority?

Mr. MOFFITT. I do not believe so, sir.

Mr. VENTO. Well, we would be especially interested in that, if we were to look at requiring or seeking additional equity in terms of these sorts of actions on collection of entrance fees, meeting the objectives, if not the specific requests.

If you need additional authority, we'd be especially interested in learning of it.

Thank you, Mr. Moffitt.

And with that, let me call this meeting to an adjournment.

Mr. MOFFITT. Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 3:55 p.m., Thursday, April 29, 1993, the Committee was adjourned, subject to call of the Chair.]

A P P E N D I X

APRIL 29, 1993

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE HEARING RECORD

**OPENING STATEMENT FOR
THE HONORABLE JAMES V. HANSEN
SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS,
FORESTS & PUBLIC LANDS
HEARING ON RECREATION FEES
APRIL 29, 1993**

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate you scheduling a hearing on the topic of recreational user fees today. I note that this is a subject included within our overall budget target under the reconciliation measure procedures which we will be taking up in the near future, and therefore this hearing is very timely.

I believe that it is especially timely for this Committee to take up this matter since we have been spending a lot of time reviewing various activities on Federal lands from a cost perspective. Just last week, we had another lengthy

hearing on the issue of grazing on federal lands and how the grazing industry is subsidized to the extent of about \$20 million per year.

For comparison purposes, I requested staff to undertake a similar analysis of recreational program cost recovery. According to budget submittals by the various agencies as displayed on the chart, you can see that the recreational users of our Federal lands will be subsidized in the amount of about \$1.4 billion this year. Just last month, the Interior Department Inspector General reported that the National Park Service failed to collect about \$123 million in recreation use fees in 1991.

For these reasons, and because I find that the current fee of \$10 for a family to visit Yellowstone National Park for a week is ridiculously low, I must express my support for the Clinton Administration in following the lead of the Bush Administration which sought revision of the recreational fee program last Congress.

On the other hand, I must express the caveats that (1) increased recreational fees must be only for the use of developed recreation sites and not for general access to Federal lands and (2) that the fees recreational users pay must return to their benefit on the ground. I know that the Chairman has worked toward these same goals in the past and I would hope to work with him in this upcoming effort.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
 DISTRICT OFFICE
 801 BURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
 2021 225-2865
 DISTRICT OFFICE
 204 FEDERAL BUILDING
 KANSAS CITY, KS 64101
 (913) 821-0832
 DISTRICT OFFICE
 1133 WEST 95TH STREET
 SUITE 217
 OVERLAND PARK, KS 66212
 (913) 383-2013

Congress of the United States
 House of Representatives
 Washington, DC 20515-1603

SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE
 RANKING REPUBLICAN
 FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
 SELECT COMMITTEE ON AGING
 VICE CHAIRMAN
 ENVIRONMENTAL AND ENERGY STUDY COMMITTEE
 AT LARGE MEMBER
 REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE

Statement of Congresswoman Jan Meyers (R-Kansas)

before the

Natural Resources Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands

April 29, 1993

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, I appreciate having this opportunity to submit a statement on President Clinton's budget proposal to raise recreation fees, including those for National Park Service units.

I commend President Clinton and Secretary of Interior Bruce Babbitt for their commitment to tackle the \$2.2 billion backlog of infrastructure repair and maintenance in our national park system. However, I am concerned that the President's proposal to fund these much-needed repairs is based exclusively on raising recreation fees.

I don't believe park visitors should be required to shoulder the full cost of this massive repair bill. To a family watching every dollar, hikers, outdoor enthusiasts, and especially to family groups, it may be a big deal. Even a modest increase may make the difference whether a park experience is possible or not.

Today I offer an alternative funding mechanism to raise funds for national park system repairs and maintenance. My suggestion matches the revenue raised by the President's proposal without forcing park visitors to foot the bill.

A couple of weeks ago, I introduced H.R. 1493, the National Park Service Concessions Policy Reform Act. I know National Park Service concessions reform is not the issue today--I hope it soon will be--but I think H.R. 1493 provides an excellent mechanism to finance these necessary national park repairs. My bill authorizes the Secretary of Interior to set minimum franchise fees for concessions contracts, either new or up for renewal.

Under my bill, these franchise fees will no longer be deposited in general revenue and subject to an administration's budget folly, but directed solely to a special trust fund devoted to park repair and maintenance. Presently, on average, concessioners are paying franchise fees to the federal government of about three percent, and these revenues are not being reinvested in the national park infrastructure. However, if more equitable franchise fees are imposed on concession contracts, funding could be generated for repairs. For example, if franchise fees were to average 10 percent, \$53 million would be raised and used for national park system repairs and maintenance. The revenue intake from my proposal would match the revenue estimate President Clinton hopes to raise by increasing

recreational fees.

Mr. Chairman, rather than raise recreational fees, which could make national parks less accessible to all our poor citizens, I would recommend that Congress take a look at my proposal. I think it is a much better alternative. If a dollar or two increase in entrance fees begins driving away national park visitors, it will not only reduce concessioners' profits, but also the meager return the federal government currently receives in franchise fees.

I want to assure the Subcommittee that it is not my intent to disparage the President's proposal, but merely bring forth my own proposal as another means to pay for national park repairs.

Finally, although concessions reform has not yet reached the top of the Subcommittee's agenda, I hope you will take a close look at H.R. 1493. I would be more than glad to discuss this bill with you, and I welcome your support for it. I would also ask that the Subcommittee hold hearings on this issue.

Thank you for the opportunity to discuss my bill with you.

A BILL

To amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, to provide for an increase in recreation fees, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SEC. 1. ADMISSION AND SPECIAL RECREATION USE FEES.

Section 4(a) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 460~~1~~--6a(a)), is amended:

(a) by inserting in the first sentence of the first paragraph after the words "National Park System" the words "and the Bureau of Land Management" and by inserting after the words "National Recreation Areas" the words ", National Monuments, National Volcanic Monuments, National Scenic Areas, and areas of concentrated public use";

(b) in paragraph (1)(A) by striking out "\$25" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$50";

(c) in paragraph (1)(B) by striking out "\$15" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$30";

(d) by adding at the end of paragraph (i) the following new subparagraph:

"(C) For purposes of this subsection, 'areas of concentrated public use' shall meet each of the following criteria:

(i) be managed primarily for outdoor recreation purposes;

- (ii) provide facilities and services necessary to accommodate heavy public use;
- (iii) contain at least one major recreation attraction including, but not limited to, a lake, river, historical site, or geologic feature; and
- (iv) provide public access such that admission fees can be efficiently collected at one or more centralized locations.";

(e) in paragraph (2) by striking out "\$5 per vehicle" in the fourth sentence and "\$3 per person" in the sixth sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "\$16 per vehicle" and "\$8 per person" respectively; and

(f) in paragraph (11) by striking out the first sentence.

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF MINIMUM FACILITIES FOR RECREATION USE FEES.

The first sentence of section 4(b) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 460~~1~~--6a(b)), is amended by replacing the first colon with a period and striking out the remainder of the sentence.

SEC. 3. COSTS OF COLLECTION.

Section 4(i)(1) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 460~~1~~--6a(i)(1)), is amended by replacing the period at the end of the first sentence with a colon and inserting thereafter the following:

"Provided, That the collecting agency may withhold from the special account and retain an amount equal to the

additional costs directly associated with the collection of such fees, and amounts so retained are hereby made available without further appropriation until the end of each fiscal year, subsequent to the date of enactment, to be expended only for additional personnel and infrastructure directly required to carry out the purposes of this section. Any unobligated amounts so retained remaining available in such account at the end of each fiscal year, will be deposited in the special account established pursuant to title V, section 5201, of Public Law 100-203."

A BILL

To authorize the imposition of recreation user fees at water resources development areas administered by the Department of the Army, and for other purposes.

1 Be it enacted by the Senate and House of
2 Representatives of the United States of America in Congress
3 assembled, That the second sentence of section 210 of the
4 Flood Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 746; 16 U.S.C. 460d-3)
5 is amended to read:

6 "Notwithstanding section 4(b) of the Land and Water
7 Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (78 Stat. 897:
8 16 U.S.C. 4601-6a(b)), the Secretary of the Army is
9 authorized to charge fees for the use of developed
10 recreation sites and facilities, including, but not
11 limited to, campsites, swimming beaches, and
12 boat launching ramps; however, the Secretary shall not
13 charge fees for the use or provision of drinking water,
14 wayside exhibits, general purpose roads, overlook sites,
15 toilet facilities, or general visitor information. The
16 fees shall be deposited into the special Treasury
17 account for the Corps of Engineers that was established
18 by section 4(i) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund
19 Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601-6a(i)).".

20 SEC. 2. Section 4 of the Land and Water Conservation
21 Fund Act of 1965, as amended, (78 Stat. 897; 16 U.S.C.
22 4601-6a) is further amended by deleting the next to the last
23 sentence of subsection (b).

FY 94 Fee Collection Proposal (\$ mil)

| | <u>FY 92</u> (Actual) | <u>FY 93</u> | <u>FY 94</u> | <u>+Over FY93</u> |
|------------------|--------------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------------|
| DAILY ENTRANCE | 38.6 | 43.6 | 65.45 | 21.85 |
| ANNUAL PARK PASS | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.7 | .2 |
| GOLDEN EAGLE | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.6 | 1.6 |
| | <u>44.1</u> | <u>49.1</u> | <u>72.75</u> | <u>23.65</u> |
| USER | 21.9 | 22.9 | 32.9 | 10.0 |
| | <u>66.0</u> | <u>72.0</u> | <u>105.65</u> | <u>33.65</u> |

THE FY 94 RATES WILL INCREASE AS FOLLOWS:

| | <u>FROM</u> | <u>TO</u> |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|-------------|
| GOLDEN EAGLE | \$25 | \$35 |
| ANNUAL PARK PASS | \$10 & \$15 | \$15 & \$20 |
| RAISE SINGLE VISIT ENTRANCE FEES AT: | | |
| | vehicle/person | veh / per |
| 1 park | --- \$3 | --- \$4 |
| 8 parks | \$5 \$3 | \$11 \$5 |
| 16 parks | \$5 \$3 | \$ 8 \$4 |
| <u>3</u> parks | \$10 \$4 | \$11 \$5 |
| Total | 28 parks | |

THE THREE FEE RATE TIERS ARE RETAINED AS FOLLOWS:

| FY 93 | | FY 94 | |
|----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|
| <u>Vehicle</u> | <u>Person</u> | <u>Vehicle</u> | <u>Person</u> |
| \$10 | \$4 | \$11 | \$5 |
| 5 | 3 | 8 | 4 |
| 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 |

3-17-93

Proposed Legislative Maximums of \$16 Vehicle / \$8 Person
 (gradual implementation beginning 1994)
BOLD highlight denotes fee increase

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE - ENTRANCE FEE RATES

| <u>PARK</u> | FY 1993 | | FY 1994 | |
|---------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | <u>VEH</u> | <u>PER</u> | <u>VEH</u> | <u>PER</u> |
| ACADIA NP | \$5.00 | \$3.00 | \$8.00 | \$4.00 |
| ADAMS NHS | -- | 2.00 | | |
| ANDREW JOHNSON NHS | -- | 2.00 | | |
| ANTIETAM NB | -- | 2.00 | | |
| APPOMATTOX COURT HOUSE NHP | -- | 2.00 | | |
| ARCHES NP | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| ASSATEAGUE ISLAND NS | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| AZTEC RUINS NM | -- | 2.00 | | |
| BADLANDS NP | 5.00 | 3.00 | 8.00 | 4.00 |
| BANDELIER NM | 5.00 | 3.00 | 8.00 | 4.00 |
| BENT'S OLD FORT | -- | 2.00 | | |
| BIG BEND NP | 5.00 | 3.00 | 8.00 | 4.00 |
| BIG HOLE NB | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| BLACK CANYON OF THE GUNNISON NM | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| BOOKER T. WASHINGTON NM | -- | 2.00 | | |
| BRYCE CANYON NP | 5.00 | 3.00 | 8.00 | 4.00 |
| CABRILLO NM | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| CANYONLANDS NP | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| CAPE COD NS | 5.00 | 3.00 | 8.00 | 4.00 |
| CAPITOL REEF NP | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| CAPULIN VOLCANO NM | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| CARL SANDBURG NHS | -- | 2.00 | | |
| CASA GRANDE NM | -- | 2.00 | | |
| CASTILLO DE SAN MARCOS NM | -- | 2.00 | | |
| CEDAR BREAKS NM | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| CHACO CULTURE NHP | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| C & O CANAL (Great Falls, Md) | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| CHICKAMAUGA AND CHATTANOOGA NMP | -- | 2.00 | | |
| CHIRICAHUA NM | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| CHRISTIANSTED NHS | -- | 2.00 | | |
| COLONIAL NHP | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| COLORADO NM | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| CRATER LAKE NP | 5.00 | 3.00 | 8.00 | 4.00 |
| CRATERS OF THE MOON NM | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| DEATH VALLEY NM | 5.00 | 3.00 | 8.00 | 4.00 |
| DENALI NP | -- | 3.00 | -- | 4.00 |
| DEVILS TOWER NM | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| DINOSAUR NM | 5.00 | 3.00 | 8.00 | 4.00 |
| EDISON NHS | -- | 2.00 | | |
| EFFIGY MOUNDS NM | -- | 2.00 | | |
| EISENHOWER NHS | -- | 2.00 | | |
| EL MORRO NM | -- | 2.00 | | |
| EVERGLADES NP | 5.00 | 3.00 | 11.00 | 5.00 |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-------|------|-------|------|
| FLORISSANT FOSSIL BEDS NM | -- | 2.00 | | |
| FORT CLATSOP NMEM | -- | 2.00 | | |
| FORT DAVIS NHS | -- | 2.00 | | |
| FORT FREDERICA NM | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| FORT LARAMIE NHS | -- | 2.00 | | |
| FORT LARNED NHS | -- | 2.00 | | |
| FORT MCHENRY NM | -- | 2.00 | | |
| FORT NECESSITY NB | -- | 2.00 | | |
| FORT PULASKI NM | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| FORT SCOTT NHS | -- | 2.00 | | |
| FORT SMITH NHS | -- | 2.00 | | |
| FORT STANWIX | -- | 2.00 | | |
| FORT UNION NM | -- | 2.00 | | |
| FORT VANCOUVER NHS | -- | 2.00 | | |
| FORT WASHINGTON | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| GEORGE ROGERS CLARK NHP | -- | 2.00 | | |
| GEORGE WASHINGTON BIRTHPLACE NM | -- | 2.00 | | |
| GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER NM | -- | 2.00 | | |
| GLACIER NP | 5.00 | 3.00 | 11.00 | 5.00 |
| GOLDEN SPIKE NHS | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| GRAND CANYON NP | 10.00 | 4.00 | 11.00 | 5.00 |
| GRAND PORTAGE NM | -- | 2.00 | | |
| GRAND TETON NP | 10.00 | 4.00 | 11.00 | 5.00 |
| GRANT-KOHR'S RANCH NHS | -- | 2.00 | | |
| GREAT FALLS PARK (Va) | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| GREAT SAND DUNES NM | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| GULF ISLANDS NS | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| HALEAKALA NP | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| HARPERS FERRY NHP | 5.00 | 3.00 | 8.00 | 4.00 |
| HARRY S. TRUMAN NHS | -- | 2.00 | | |
| HAWAII VOLCANOES HP | 5.00 | 3.00 | 8.00 | 4.00 |
| HERBERT HOOVER NHS | -- | 2.00 | | |
| HOME OF FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT | -- | 2.00 | | |
| HOPEWELL CULTURE NHP * | -- | 2.00 | | |
| HOPEWELL FURNACE NHS | -- | 2.00 | | |
| JEFFERSON NAT'L EXPANSION MEM | -- | 2.00 | | |
| JOHN F. KENNEDY NHS | -- | 2.00 | | |
| JOHN MUIR HOUSE NHS | -- | 2.00 | | |
| JOSHUA TREE NM | 5.00 | 3.00 | 8.00 | 4.00 |
| KINGS CANYON NP | 5.00 | 3.00 | 11.00 | 5.00 |
| LASSEN VOLCANIC NP | 5.00 | 3.00 | 8.00 | 4.00 |
| LAVA BEDS NM | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| LINCOLN BOYHOOD NMEN | -- | 2.00 | | |
| LITTLE BIGHORN BATTLEFIELD ** | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| LONGFELLOW NHS | -- | 2.00 | | |
| MANASSAS NBP | -- | 2.00 | | |
| MARTIN VAN BUREN NHS | -- | 2.00 | | |
| MESA VERDE NP | 5.00 | 3.00 | 8.00 | 4.00 |
| MINUTE MAN NHP | -- | 2.00 | | |
| MONTEZUMA CASTLE NM | -- | 2.00 | | |
| MORRISTOWN NHP | -- | 2.00 | | |
| MOUNT RAINIER NP | 5.00 | 3.00 | 11.00 | 5.00 |
| NATURAL BRIDGES NM | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| OLYMPIC NP | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------|------|-------|------|
| ORGAN PIPE CACTUS NM | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| PADRE ISLAND NS | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| PEA RIDGE NMP | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| PECOS NM | -- | 2.00 | | |
| PERRY'S VICTORY & IPM | -- | 2.00 | | |
| PETERSBURG NB | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| PETRIFIED FOREST NP | 5.00 | 3.00 | 8.00 | 4.00 |
| PINNACLES NM | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| PIPE SPRING NM | -- | 2.00 | | |
| PIPESTONE NM | -- | 2.00 | | |
| PRINCE WILLIAM FOREST PARK | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| PU'UHONUA O HONAUNAU NHP | -- | 2.00 | | |
| ROCKY MOUNTAIN NP | 5.00 | 3.00 | 11.00 | 5.00 |
| SAGAMOE HILL NHS | -- | 2.00 | | |
| SAGUARO NM | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| SAINT-GAUDENS NHS | -- | 2.00 | | |
| SARATOGA NHP | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| SCOTTS BLUFF NM | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| SEQUOIA | 5.00 | 3.00 | 11.00 | 5.00 |
| SHENANDOAH NP | 5.00 | 3.00 | 11.00 | 5.00 |
| SHILOH NMP | -- | 2.00 | | |
| SUNSET CRATER NM | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| THEODORE ROOSEVELT BIRTHPLACE | -- | 2.00 | | |
| THEODORE ROOSEVELT NP | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| TONTO NM | -- | 2.00 | | |
| TUMACACORI NM | -- | 2.00 | | |
| TUZIGOOT NM | -- | 2.00 | | |
| VALLEY FORGE NHP | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| VANDERBILT MANSION NHS | -- | 2.00 | | |
| VICKSBURG NMP | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| WALNUT CANYON NM | -- | 2.00 | | |
| WHITE SANDS NM | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| WHITMAN MISSION NHS | -- | 2.00 | | |
| WILSON'S CREEK NB | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| WRIGHT BROTHERS NMEN | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| WUPATKI NM | 4.00 | 2.00 | | |
| YELLOWSTONE NP | 10.00 | 4.00 | 11.00 | 5.00 |
| YOSEMITE NP | 5.00 | 3.00 | 11.00 | 5.00 |
| ZION NP | 5.00 | 3.00 | 8.00 | 4.00 |

* 1992 name change - formerly Mound City Group

** 1992 name change - formerly Custer Battlefield



ISBN 0-16-041526-8

